



This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights and duplication or sale of all or part is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for research, private study, criticism/review or educational purposes. Electronic or print copies are for your own personal, non-commercial use and shall not be passed to any other individual. No quotation may be published without proper acknowledgement. For any other use, or to quote extensively from the work, permission must be obtained from the copyright holder/s.

CLASS AND THE CIVILISING PROCESS:
SOCIAL FACTORS IN THE ORGANISATION OF
MUSEUMS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

ELAINE STOKES

THESIS SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

OCTOBER 1987



5 001 217 7

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank Prof. Ronald Frankenberg, my supervisor, and Gordon Fyfe who supervised me for a short while. I am also very grateful to Doreen Clowes, secretary in the Department of Sociology.

Abstract:

In this thesis I first consider some ways in which the developing economy in the Nineteenth Century affected both local and national government, including policing, the Civil Service, incorporation and education. Charity, class and the ways in which economic developments led to changes in forms of leisure are discussed. This is the main concern of the second chapter which includes the emergence of large commercial outlets like music halls. I investigate whether there was a coherent mode of thought underlying these changes and whether this extended into other areas, and if so, which. Different views of progress first encountered in various histories of Nineteenth Century England are then considered. These were related to ideas about progress and civilisation. In Chapter Three these last two themes are explored and related to Elias' ideas on the Civilising Process, class and other divisions in society. In Chapter Four, these ideas are used to illustrate the history of the Great Exhibition, its organisation and the lives of some of those directly, and in the case of Pitt Rivers, indirectly, involved in it. This chapter is included because it provides an opportunity for ideas about civilisation and progress to become a formal reality. In the last chapter, the creation of some public museums is traced, especially in London, for example, the British Museum and the National Gallery. Their consequent organisation and the arrangement of exhibits are related to attempts to legislate for the creation of public museums throughout the country. It is hoped that the idea of the expert and other issues included such as the arts and manufactures debate, show how notions of civilisation and progress are entrenched in ideas linked to the economy.

Contents:

	Page
Introduction	1.
Chapter 1.	23.
Charity	27.
Policing	38.
Some Ideas on the State	53.
Education	57.
The Education Department	73.
Central and Local Rule	90.
Class and the State	93.
Notes	98.
Chapter 2.	101.
Time	105.
Blood Sports and Fairs	115.
Fairs and Wakes	119.
Pubs and Drink	128.
Temperance	136.
The Working Men's Club Movement	148.
The Music Halls	152.
Notes	182.
Chapter 3.	184.
Civilisation and Progress	184.
Evolutionary Theory	188.
Assymetry	198.
Magazines for the People	205.
Class or Classes	209.
Class and Sex	211.
Notes	226.
Chapter 4.	231.
Progress	231.
Exhibitions	240.
Some Personnel	244.
Arrangement and Ideas	252.
Some Outcomes of 1851	262.

Pitt Rivers and Progress	269.
Notes	282.
 Chapter 5.	 285.
Introduction	285.
Art and Manufacture	292.
Museums	306.
The British Museum and the National Gallery -	
Beginnings	310.
Parliamentary Moves	314.
Curiosity, Education and the Role of the Museum	327.
Collecting, Class and Trips Abroad	338.
Travellers and Access to Collections	343.
Natural History	352.
Collecting	356.
Damage and Legislation	367.
Access, Rights of Entry, Behaviour and Sunday	
Opening	371.
Sundays and Evenings	378.
Access to Private Collections	390.
Art History, Experts and Purchasing Policies	397.
The Arranging of Exhibits and Ideas of Progress at	
the National Gallery and British Museum	408.
Labelling and Catalogues	417.
Modern Developments: A Brief Survey	423.
Some Further Modern Developments	431.
The Good Museum Guide and Admission Charges	440.
Notes	450.
 Conclusion.	 461.
 Bibliography.	 466.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis explores class relations in 19th Century Britain in terms of education, the state, leisure activities, ideas of progress and civilisation, The Great Exhibition and the early history of the public museum. Topics such as museums are quite often mentioned in history books. The museum in the 19th Century may even be given a paragraph or a page. (This is not including books *about* museums, for example, A. Wittlin, 1949.) Such items are often mentioned as examples of 19th Century moral education or recreation. Hugh Cunningham, who has written a work *Leisure and the Industrial Revolution*, [1980], describes how the interest in the history of leisure emerged in the 1970's alongside the growth of "social history as a self-conscious discipline." [1980, p.11] Previously, its study was generally left, "almost exclusively to amateur historians as a colourful, even amusing, branch of history on which no serious historian would waste much time." Cunningham's observations on the history of leisure are even more pertinent on the subject of museums. He says:

As a subspecies of social history; the history of leisure remains little more than a previously neglected by-way of history which, however fascinating, does little more than footnote our understanding of the nineteenth century.

I am interested to explore whether this view is justified; whether nothing can be said of museums except as a footnote or in terms of the *story* of its past. Cunningham defines leisure as a part of economic history and is against "crude" Marxist interpretations of the relationship between leisure and the economic base. He continues: "The problem we are left with

... is to gain more understanding of the relation between leisure and the economic structure, and to see in what ways leisure was determined."[p.197] As I said earlier, my initial interest in this area stemmed mainly from the literature about class relations in the last century, as well as recent writing about the working class. The basic questions of class seem to revolve around whether 19th Century economic growth meant progress for the working classes; whether the working classes 'sold out' to the new economic order; what was the nature of middle class power or control and which ways was this exerted, accepted and resisted. It is not simply a matter of defining the "relationship between structural inequalities and working class consciousness." [Eds. Clarke, Critchner and Johnson, 1979, p.24] As Critcher says, historical interpretation must include the aristocracy and middle classes. It must not be seen as *inferior* to sociological or phenomenological enquiry. For:

It is in the history of such struggles between classes that we can identify those ideas, forces, groups and moments which limit or promote the development of particular kinds of class consciousness ... History is not to be tagged on to contemporary analysis, but must essentially inform it,"
[p.38]

Critchner describes post-war developments in studies of the working classes and he finds that many are related to the tradition of social investigation of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Johnson notes how the "intelligent listening" of Mayhew and mass observation of the 1930's and '40's were precusory to the working class studies of the '50's and '60's.[p.43] The early 19th Century saw "reforming" studies and the late century, poverty studies such as Booth. The histories of "social institutions" which characterizes the work of the Webbs and which Johnson

calls the 'Fabian genre' saw history, however, as a 'backdrop'. Johnson criticizes this approach for its neglect of culture and emphasis on narrative account.[p.46] In fact, the Webbs:

... had no feeling at all (except distrust) for rank and file tendencies or for working class culture outside of the 'educative' institutions they described. Their viewpoint on culture as a whole was that of the late Victorian philanthropist transposed, as it were, to a Labour Party mode.

The Hammonds, however, [*The Town Labourer*, 1978, and *The Bleak Age*, 1945] approached their work from the opposite angle. In *The Bleak Age* they stated that their aim was to show the 'sense of wrong' created by economic changes and "industrial civilization". Discontent they said, came "from the imagination" which was oppressed by industry and the State in the 19th Century.[1945, p.9] Engels, too, [1969], and later writers such as E.P. Thompson, [1979], wrote of the effects of factories and towns on the workers' quality of life and working class responses to them. This concern with the 'quality of life' for the working class enters all similar works having a pessimistic view of the Industrial Revolution. Put succinctly, they encapsulate the sense that "human life is worth living, or rather can be and ought to be made worth living ... it is the *a priori* of social theory." [Marcuse, 1968, p.10] Thompson acknowledges that there were times when living standards improved' but he judges the 19th Century in terms of human suffering. Philip Corrigan, [1980a, xxii] writing later, also recognises that capitalists' concern with efficiency and effectiveness has produced some real progress for people in terms of health and housing. Paul Richards, [P. Corrigan, Ed. 1980a, p.77] even talks about "The genuine humanitarianism of some policy matters ..."² He adds, however, that inequalities in power relations, for example, between

servants of the State and the working classes, reveal areas in which the former are not the "neutral social scientists" they liked to appear. As I hope to show later in the thesis, politicians and State experts had deeply embedded views on civilization³ and progress. This motivating idea is also embedded amongst other things in the works of the political economists of the 19th Century, in parliamentary debate, in 'improving' magazines designed for workers and in the work of commentators such as T.H.S. Escott, who present a common sense front. The growth of industrial capital is seen as necessary for 'Progress' (an a priori necessity) and for the most part as a "good thing" for humanity. Its existence and organisation were, moreover, inevitable. Escott, writing in the 1870's, links industrialisation, culture and progress when he affirms its civilizing effects. He believes that prior to the industrial revolution, Lancashire was in a "state of barbarism".[Escott, 1879, p.75]

This view is countered in such writers as the Hammonds, E.P. Thompson et al, but within such writings (especially later 20th Century works) there are differences about the nature of working class responses to industrial changes. This is an ongoing debate and it gained momentum and greater definition with the use of the concept of social control in the late 1970's. The historians in *Social Control in the 19th Century*, Ed. Donajgradzki, [1977], owe a great deal to the writers of the '50's and '60's - Raymond Williams, Thompson, Hoggart, (and also the 'anthropological' contributions of Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter, Young and Wilmott etc ...) Ideas were presented about culture and the working classes from which 'Cultural Studies' emerged. Culture was no longer presumed to be 'high' or 'low'. As Stuart Hall commented:

They forced on their readers attention the proposition that "concentrated in the word *culture* are questions directly raised by the great historical changes which the changes in industry, democracy and class, in their own way, represent, and to which the changes in art are a closely related response." [Quoted from Williams, 1963, p.16] This was a question for the 1960's and '70's, as well as the 1860's and '70's.

(See also Critchner and Johnson, 1979,1

Writers in the 1970's and '80's have benefited from previous work (though not always agreeing with them) and have gone back to the 19th Century to re-interpret class relations. Hearn, for example, wished to uncover the conditions which would lead to revolutionary activity (We shall discuss the reasons for studying 19th Century history later in this section.) The use of the idea of social control, though perhaps named, is not, according to F.M.L. Thompson, an entirely new one. As we see in Chapter 1, there were fears of social disintegration in the last century. The transformations of industrialisation occurred, however, "without suffering the collapse, or revolution, which many contemporaries from right and left, from Martineau to Marx, and Eldon to Engels, had anticipated with dread or relish." (F.M.L. Thompson, 1981, p.189) According to Thompson, what is new, is that in the 1970's-1980, social historians "have approached a whole range of the activities of power groups as exercises in devising mechanisms of social control ... " (This links in with the developments of the history of leisure which I mentioned initially.) These mechanisms, further, "conditioned and manipulated the propertyless masses into accepting ... *behaviour* necessary to sustain the social order ..." (my emphasis). Donajgrodzki, [1977], defends it as a good way of explaining relations between rich and poor stemming from a power imbalance. It must be seen, he says, however, as only *part* of the meaning of, for example,

leisure in the 19th Century. Gareth Stedman-Jones, [1983, p.76f] criticizes these ideas saying that this concept emerged with works on recreation and the decline of 'traditional' forms of leisure and that problems which do not fit into the social control mould are ignored. For him, the primary consideration should be *relations of production*. He states:

There is no substantial study, for example, of how far changes in the sexual division of labour before during and after industrialisation produced changing sexually segregated patterns of leisure ... (Stedman-Jones 1983 'p.77']⁴

Stedman-Jones' criticism is justified in his call for greater investigation into the transformation/decline of so-called 'traditional' pastimes. I feel, however, that he believes in the pre-industrial cosiness of life and work to some extent, because of the *very* problem he poses. There is some evidence that although there was greater focus on the home as work place (which continued in some areas well into the 19th Century), that this did not mean less sexual segregation of leisure time and activity. Samuel Bamford reveals how during the "rush bearing" in his village, the young men met in ale-houses to collect a fund and how they kept together as a group in case there was fighting. Meanwhile, the girls would be using any spare time to sew their own and their mensfolk's finery. The collection and display of goods for the cart "was exclusively the work of the girls and women" (1893p.132) and the lads drew it around. After the rushes had been taken to the Church both sexes went to the pub. At Easter, however, "Men thronged to the ale-houses", but Easter Wednesday started off as a more sedate affair for women, men and children who all "walked out". Festivities included visiting the ale-house, dancing and for

the men, a fight. Sexual segregation occurred even during some of the activities where the sexes mixed, in terms of differently defined roles and activities. There is perhaps a case to be made from the assertion that sexual segregation of leisure activities was greater during and after widespread urban industrialisation or at least in those areas where it existed, but this is not the *whole* picture. Women went to gin Palaces and music halls, although they were essentially male domains. From the 1860's onwards, women are *encouraged* to go to the music hall by entrepreneurs like Charles Merton, in order to make it respectable and give it a 'family' atmosphere. Witnesses to select committees on museums also begin to use this as an argument for Sunday and evening admittance which was argued, would enable the working man to take his family. The Great Exhibition had been seen as a 'family outing' along with many other excursions, but the main point of reference in discussions about leisure is the *male* worker. As far as museums go, we see this in the 1830's committees on arts and manufacture and beyond.

Stedman-Jones further criticises the notion of social control for its over-emphasis on "calculating capitalists" who set out to destroy working class recreations. He winces at the clichéd pictures of the dominated working class being controlled by music hall, rational recreation etc. F.M.L. Thompson, however, states that the *motives* of middle class reformers is not in question (i.e. a desire to change behaviour, morals etc), but that "their *success* is another matter." (1981, p.152.)

Between them, Stedman-Jones and F.M.L. Thompson present reasonable critiques of social control. The former emphasises its tendency to "non-explanation" and "incoherence" while recognising its versatility. He says it is not a Marxist concept but that

it can be tacked on to Marxist ideas. This is because social control "suggests a static metaphor of equilibrium"[Stedman-Jones, 1979, p.80] which is disturbed, then re-established on a new basis. This system of a prior state, break down and renewal goes against the Marxist idea of the relations of production being continually reproduced. Class conflict is ever present and "not a sign of breakdown."

Thompson also makes the point that the notion of social control can be used in so blanket a fashion as to be worthless. If it merely represents law and order then "it is scarcely a great leap forward", [199] and if it "is restricted to efforts which induced people to behave willingly and "voluntarily" in ways that the guardians of law and order deemed conducive to law and order, then the concept becomes meaningful." He goes on to describe how attitudes to animal cruelty have changed mainly due to middle class pressure groups and laws. This process, he calls socialisation, not of a dominant class over a powerless class, but of a minority group over the whole of society and he asks for more research into the way laws alter social habits. He believes that those benefitting from laws include the weak and underprivileged for example, women, children, animals and so forth, and that these laws have "no clear class basis or class overtones."

What Thompson *is* describing is the "civilising process" without the elements of class and power, [see Chapter 3] rather than socialisation as he defines it. Whereas Stedman-Jones' starting point is relations of production, F.M.L. Thompson plays down the element of class. (This is amply refuted in Philip Corrigan, [1980a] - see especially Harrison and Mort, Chapter 3, as Stedman-Jones' rather narrow emphasis is on the workplace and has a tendency to make the worker male.) I have found that

the ideas of Elias and the definition of morality and relations of production in Corrigan, [1980a, See below Chapter 5] have given me important organising concepts. Rather than rely on either social control or purely economic presumption, I have tried to analyse in terms of ideas of civilisation (including the civilising process) and class. Whereas Stedman-Jones is partially right to say that the greatest social control, if the phrase must be used, is the wage relation itself, he does not take into account other forms of labour mostly assigned to women. Although I do not myself concentrate on it, I think it is important to be aware of this. Stedman-Jones states, for example, that 'traditional' pastimes died because workers allowed them to do so, whereas 'Leisure institutions which remained essential to workers - pubs for example - were strongly defended.'⁽¹⁹⁸³⁾[p.88] Whereas I have said the pub was not *purely* a non-female place, (including bar-maids, etc.) many women openly recognised the oppressive side in terms of lack of money and ill-treatment. I do analyse, however, the importance of work in terms of the formation of museums.[Chapter 5]

Stedman-Jones' dislike of stereotypical portraits of capitalists and the working class victim can also be seen in the much earlier work of E.P. Thompson. When the latter was writing in 1963, he was very much aware that he was going "against the weight of prevailing orthodoxies".[1979, p.12] These include that of the Fabians, where working people are the "passive victims of laissez-faire", except for a handful of far-sighted organizers such as Francis Place. (Another was the 'Pilgrim's Progress' orthodoxy which gave an evolutionary history for the Welfare State.) E.P. Thompson emphasised that such beliefs "tend to obscure the agency of working people".⁽¹⁹⁷⁹⁾[p.18] One of the many examples he gives later

in the book is that of Jeremiah Brandreth whom, he says, the Hammonds characterise as an illiterate dupe, but who was, in fact, literate and courageous. His friends also were far from "unlettered yokels".(1979, p.732)

This question of working class agency is, therefore, not new and moreover is not yet dead. Richard Johnson, (W.P.C.S., 1976, Chapter 11) says that for writers like Nairn and Perry Anderson, the British working class is "that exasperating entity".(W.P.C.S., 1976, p.19) They interpret the working class as "corporate" - inward-looking and dense - and as having failed to grasp revolutionary moments. Johnson prefers the problematic that analyses *strengths* (and we shall return briefly to this later) and agrees with E.P. Thompson's "class-in-the-making approach. Anderson's treatment of class is further criticised for:

it lacks the experiential, phenomenological dimensions of Thompson's own Marxism *but* also any kind of historical sociology. This, (Anderson/Nairn's) working class has no economic function nor social being. It is fooled in the head by ideas but not exploited and governed in the fact,
(W.P.C.S., p.22.)

The other extreme in the debate can be said to be represented by the idea that the working class had free choice in certain areas. In this idea, the State only intervenes at points of failure and the main agent of moralisation is the mother. This would seem to be refuted in the work of Harrison and Mort where women within the family were (and still are) restricted in various areas by the State. Surely it is not automatically patronising to acknowledge imbalances of power? Indeed, these imbalances (between race, sex and class) are often recognised by those involved and even if they are not this does not simply mean they do not exist. An overall emphasis on free choice fails to recognise what Corrigan calls

'the dominant morality' of capitalism. [See Chapter 5] It is this which links the spheres of culture and behaviour around the State to capitalism which itself embodies social relations through the relations of production. The State, says Corrigan, is made up of a set of relationships which did not 'drop from the sky' but which was built up over time through "complicated and extensive struggles ... by human beings grouped together by their differing relationships to the dominant mode of production." [1980a, xxiii] I would hope that this thesis illustrates something of this.

Gramsci's idea of hegemony is also one which I found useful although I will not go very much into it here as it has been done so elsewhere. Gray, (in Bennett et al, 1981), discusses Gramsci and the 'conspiracy thesis' of class. As he says:

I certainly would not claim to resolve this problem; we probably lack the concepts and language to do so, But I do want to suggest that Gramsci provides an indispensable point of approach,
[p,235]

For Gramsci, power is held by a social group, either through domination or intellectual and moral leadership. The dominant class will lead in the economic and intellectual fields as well as the moral. The State, says Gramsci, extends beyond government and maintains domination for one group by obtaining the consent of civil society. (A consent which is being continually educated.) This is achieved through education, the legal system, the police, etc. and also by "a multitude of other so-called private initiatives and activities."

Elias recognises part of this hegemonic process, whereby dominant groups impose standards of behaviour, dress, levels of repugnance and so on.

Extended with greater centralisation of power, changes in conduct relate to feelings of shame inculcated from those above to those below, for example, teacher/pupil, parent/child. In societies where the physical forces of control are more or less kept hidden, then, says Elias, the civilising process is essential to the powers that be.⁹ Elias' work is also interesting for the many examples he gives throughout (mainly) the middle ages to the 19th Century, (although the most concrete examples are from the earlier times.)

Gramsci, too, talks about the "civilising activity of" the State.

Paul Richards, [Corrigan, 1980a p.74], relates Gramsci's concept of hegemony to the concern in the 19th Century about social evils where consent "has to be achieved and maintained through the promotion and extension of 'moral' education, although coercion is always present". Richards quotes Poulantzas who said that "This was so in Britain after 1832, where the landed aristocracy occupied the political scene and provided the top bureaucratic-military personnel, whereas the bourgeoisie held hegemony." [n.42, p.184, from N. Poulantzas, *Power and Social Classes* (1968), 1975, p.230] According to Richards, the creation of the Education Department in 1839, brought a rural/urban alliance important in the face of the Chartist threat. Is it coincidental that the 1841 select committee on National Monuments should concentrate a relatively (for example, compared to 1835 and 1836 arts and manufactures) large part of its energy on the question of working class behaviour?

What of the people who Gramsci calls the functionaries of cultural, political and economic organisations - the traditional and organic intellectuals? The latter, briefly, are the policy makers, managers and technicians and the former are writers, critics, clergy and so on. In

reality, they can overlap. How does this relate to this thesis? Gray expresses it thus:

It is perhaps, particularly those institutions and practices held to be outside politics, to stand above the struggle of formal parties (which are confined to the representative parts of the state) that condense the power of the hegemonic fraction. The State itself, Gramsci suggests, cements the power bloc under the hegemony of a particular class or fraction, and in this sense, acts as a 'party' organising the dominant class.
[Bennett et al, 1981, p.242)

In Chapter 1 of this thesis, I describe this as the growth of the "disinterested" civil servant. (The British Museum in the 1850's began to be a part of the civil service exam system although the Principal Librarian protested. The need for greater uniformity of pay levels was, however, supported by the staff. See Chapter 1 of this thesis.) Gramsci's use of the term "parties" to encompass wider groupings than simply political parties is helpful in pointing to *similarities* between, for example, a Tory reformer and to those not generally identified with political allegiances, for example, Eastlake. The parliamentary debates on museums in 1845 saw Ewart and Peel voting differently, but a close reading of the discourse shows certain fundamental presumptions held in common.[See below Chapter 5] In the last chapter I explore the role of the 'expert', his influence in policy and social contracts and the question of whether museums can be said to be part of the process Gramsci calls hegemony. (James Joll, [1977, p.101] quotes from Gramsci, [1971, p.350] - 'Every relationship of "hegemony" is necessarily a pedagogic relationship.' See below Chapter 5 on the role of museums.) Gray also discusses intellectuals, noting their "caste-like" modes of cohesion "which created links between hierarchies of intellectuals and included the

development of 'genteel' professional status and qualifications." [Bennet et al, p.237] This idea is included in the final chapter with a discussion of the status of Charles Eastlake, (later knighted) and with the tracing of the developments of accessibility to public and private collections. I am also interested to see if there is a relationship between the ideas of the intellectuals and the way exhibits were chosen and displayed.

I have relied, as far as possible, on biography, autobiography, magazines, diaries, Hansard and select committee reports, (as well as other literature.) These later reports are by no means exhaustible, but those used are closely read. Quentin Bell, [1963, p.53] whose own book on the Schools of Design explores the 1835 and 1836 select committees on art and manufacture, points to the importance and worth of such sources. He calls the Report of 1835:

'A veritable mine of information', For here, packed into about 350 pages, are the considered opinions of artists, theorists, manufacturers and politicians of a generation which had for the first time become fully aware of the impact of the Industrial Revolution upon the arts. It is a mine which has not been very extensively worked,
[Q. Bell, 1963, p.53]

Edward Higgs also advocates the use of public records for Select Committee Reports and other papers. [1983, p.141] He notes how the link between education and museums is made in such records and, indeed, files at the P.R.O. which pertain to museum staffing and exhibitions, for example, are often in the education section. At the beginning of this introduction, I mentioned that there was a tendency, though this is lessening, to disregard leisure (and museums even more so,) as of any import or relevance to political and economic developments in the 19th Century. Higgs also describes this:

The history of the State's provision of leisure facilities really begins in the 18th Century with the establishment of the core of the great national museums and art galleries.¹⁰ Their subsequent development is amply (perhaps even tediously?) chronicled in the public records. Many historians would regard such facilities as of marginal interest to the history of British leisure. The metamorphosis of such institutions, however, from the preserves of a cultural elite to the mass educational venues of today, is surely important, if only as an indication of changing attitudes among the elite to the education or entertainment of the populace.
[Higgs, 1983, p.141]

Something of this is included in the descriptions of access to galleries and museums. [Chapter 5 of this Thesis] I am, however, interested in further links between society and museums. Cunningham also describes how using sources that have been mentioned above, a political dimension was added to his historical work. He says:

A glance at my references will show that many of my sources are political; legislation, and parliamentary inquiries and debates. Decisions and arguments about leisure were decisions and arguments about power and about control, that is to say they were political. Leisure too, it is necessary to emphasise, is economic history; a history of production (the leisure industries) and of consumption (both of time and goods.)
[1980, pp.11-12]

What I am trying to do is to explore relations between leisure and class in 19th Century England and as I said above, I have also used a few working class autobiographies and, to some degree, this guards against what Stedman-Jones calls 'ideal types'.¹¹ Where I take issue with the latter is his pronouncement that the 'arena' of leisure has been over-politicised. He says, "The primary point of a holiday is not political: it is to enjoy yourself, for tomorrow you must work."⁽¹⁹⁸³ p.89] This is true and an understandable reaction to such writers as Francis Hearn, [1978], who emphasise that workers sold their ideals for the wage transaction and

became incorporated. His tone suggests that working class people have let us all down in terms of challenging capitalism.¹² Stedman-Jones' main point, however, is that because some writers use capitalist domination of leisure as a lynchpin of social control "it restricts capitalism to the market place".(1983,p82my emphasis) This further restricts specific ideologies to working class people's "position as consumers of leisure" while ignoring the importance of relations of production. The danger of Stedman-Jones' emphasis is that it goes the *other* way and restricts capitalism to "the struggle in the factory."¹³ I want to see if these issues *can* be balanced against each other in such a clear cut way, to explore the links between relations of production and leisure and to indicate, where relevant, the importance (or not) of the activities of the State in all this.

To conclude my introduction, I would like briefly to discuss the use of an historical framework linked to aims in writing history. As we saw above, Marcuse believed that any writing about society was linked to that writer's view of the world. Further, he advocates emphasising this with the ultimate aim of helping to transform society. Of course, this view has been criticised and will continue to be so. Malcolm Thomis, for example, attacks the Hammonds' work, saying that history must be approached without recourse to moral choices. The Hammonds go too far beyond "describing and explaining" and take on the role of "social critic".(Thomis, 1974, p.5) They are pessimistic about the Industrial Revolution and indeed, mount a "scathing" attack on it. Thomis himself, however, reveals how difficult it is for the historian to tread, what he calls, the precarious path of objectivity that he sets himself. The Hammonds did not define themselves in this way anyway, but Thomis

believes he can achieve what they failed to do, that is, avoid value judgements.¹⁴ Thomis's is the optimistic interpretation of industrial capitalism; the latter must be accepted because it is real; it was necessary to stave off mass starvation through a rising population; riots and machine breaking were the result of the "dangerous coincidence" of high prices and unemployment. (As Hobsbawm says, however, "On a gloomy interpretation of [the Industrial Revolution] the popular discontent of the early 19th Century makes sense; on an optimistic interpretation, it is almost inexplicable." [1964, p.125]) A belief in the unavailability of progress leads such writers as Thomis to be blind to *their own* biases.

Some recent writers have also refused this type of "intellectual mask." Philip Corrigan, for example, has "come out" and given explicit socialist aims for his work. [1980a] He says that research on the State is:

A resource for understanding our current social situation and the means for its transformation in a direction which will extend the much discussed 'benefits' of the 20th Century more widely among those who live in England.¹⁵
(Corrigan, 1980a p.xvi)

Too much theory, he goes on, appears to be for itself and for the writer¹⁶ and not as part of "any possible solution." There is a long tradition of writers critical of society and this is not a new phenomena but writers such as Corrigan provide points of continuity of this view, having survived, as he puts it, too much theory. Corrigan, Ramsay and Sayer, [In Corrigan, 1980a], derive the basis of their standpoint from Marx. They say that as soon as the capitalist mode of production is seen as history, "the delusion of regulating them as natural laws of production vanishes and the prospect opens up of a new society ... " [p.17. From

Capital IV, Moscow, p.429] Joll describes how Gramsci believed historical analysis and understanding led to "man's capacity to remake his surroundings and to remake himself... "[Joll, 1977, p.90] Thus, there is the idea that a relating of the past to the present holds radical possibilities.

Other writers, with a (comparatively) thoroughgoing belief in progress also assume there are links between past and present in a developmental, progressive continuum.[See Chapter 3 of this Thesis] Stephen Yeo sums up the implications of this:

From a conservative point of view, one uninterested in change or in history except as a ratification and celebration of the present, attempts are always being made to collapse 'ways of life' into a single 'society' or 'system'. And then the way is open to say that the ways we meet, define, multiply or divide needs, constitute a single 'culture' - 'our' way of life, *the* system.
[Corrigan, 1980a, p.113]

Further, Yeo contends that this view removes the realities of ownership, power and interests so that its function is "to conceal alternative, latent potentials and achievements in the interests of existing manifest facts and ideologies."

We have seen above that much of the recent debate about the working class has been about working class agency and as Yeo says, modern Marxist writers have often attributed lack of revolutionary activity to the inadequacies of workers who were 'incorporated', 'reformist', 'apathetic' and so on. Yeo believes, however, that the politics of the writer determines how such 'success' or 'failure' is interpreted, for:

There is a continual and in the end political choice to be made, from within such enterprises today, whether to emphasise what is being achieved (however small) and could be achieved (however visionary), or to stress what has not been is not being or cannot be achieved.
[Corrigan, 1980a, p.113]

Thus the importance (for him, specifically Labour in the second half of the 20th Century) of links between the past and present "in order to get some helpful bearings on where we are now." (Corrigan, 1980a, p.125) Similarly, E.P. Thompson believes the world "is still undergoing the problems of industrialisation" and that "in some of the lost causes of the Industrial Revolution we may discover insights into social evils which we have yet to cure." (1979, p.13) Corrigan, Ramsay and Sayer state that one of their aims is to understand the present to show that "things can be different." (Corrigan, 1980, p.25) Philip Abrams has posed the problem (close to that of theoretical overproduction and its underconsumption by the general population) as being one of producing work which tries to uncover and study "intervening structures through which the past presumably became the present." (In Corrigan, 1980a, xvi. From P. Abrams, *The Sense of the Past and The Origins of Sociology*, P. Present (55), 1972, p.32) This is an aim to run throughout this thesis but I have also inevitably inadequately, included a brief survey of some 20th Century museum developments. Thorough work in this area would require much more research. In undertaking this research I have familiarised myself with a range of issues and works which Barrett et al, (In Corrigan, 1980a, p.16), say involves the risk of repetition. This is a "necessary stage" I fear and it is a well-trodden period that I cover. I sincerely hope, however, that the following work contributes in some small way to the understanding of the relationship of politics and areas of life more commonly deemed to be autonomous.

Introduction Notes

1. Hobsbawm *Industry and Empire* [Vol.3, 1978, p.160] showed how it appeared that 1862-73 wages rose by 40% and continued to rise until the end of the century. He was, however, sceptical of the use of averages; "Even if we regard these general averages as reliable, (which is doubtful), they do not, of course, give a realistic picture of the situation." This was, he said because, "... the stagnant mass of poverty at the bottom of the social pyramid remained nearly as stagnant and as nauseous as before." [p.162] A local study too, revealed something of this. A.T. McCabe (In S.P. Bell, 1974, pp.134-5) says that in Merseyside the sewers and drainage created an improvement but that the death rate in Merseyside was still very high. Disease and poverty continued. Between 1851-81, overcrowding lessened slightly, but at 6:1, the ratio of people to dwellings was not good. This figure also does not express concentrations of people. Food consumption figures per capita, show a rise nationally, but there were variations from area to area. In the 1860's the staple diet of the poor was bread and intake of protein from milk and meat was low. [p.137] In Merseyside, too, wages rose little until 1870 and increases were often swallowed up by price rises.
2. Richards says that the Factory Acts, can be seen "albeit as attempts to contain class struggle and to promote a healthy productive working class as against the effects of capitalist competition." [Corrigan, 1980a, p.77]
3. When I refer to civilisation in this work I include not only perceived notions about the stage or point of development reached by a given society, but also ideas about civilised behaviour - the civilising process. Elias uses it in this sense too, see note 9 above.
4. Stedman-Jones talks about industrialisation as though it was a distinct point in time and this is the impression we are apt to give. It must be borne in mind that it was a process over time and not a 'happening'. [See K. Tribe 1978]
5. Recent work has shown that working class people often rejected religious schools for the Dame school etc. [See P. Thompson, 1984, and F.M.L. Thompson 81, p.192-193, n.8 & 9] Later examples include Working Men's Clubs and local government, although there are also numerous examples throughout the 19th Century, including unions.
6. F.M.L. Thompson states:

It is difficult to see that anything is added to the understanding of police behaviour by saying that they were exercising a form of social control unless it is argued that all actions maintain order, and all laws are forms of social control imposed by those with power and authority on those without; which widens the concept of social control

to embrace precisely those instruments of maintaining the social order which it was initially designed to exclude, and makes the concept so general as to be valueless. (1981, p.199)

Stedman-Jones also makes the point that some actions interpreted as social control, for example railway excursions, cannot be seen totally in terms of the "arena of leisure", but also, for example, as creating housing problems for those workers evicted from their homes to make way for rail. Trips were also *enjoyable*. Stedman-Jones further is suspicious of 'social control', because of its roots in early American sociology and later Talcott Parsons. He thinks historians are very susceptible to this way of reasoning, for example, the functional draining-off of anti-social urges through various mechanisms such as sport. Donajgrodzki says that for him the attraction of 'social control' is its ability to be transideological - "It would be unfortunate were the concept to be captured either by right or left." (p.14) Johnson, however, in the same book, argues for the use of the concept with a Marxist perspective. While recognising its ambiguity when used without a theory, his work has been useful in questioning historical assumptions, i.e. "That the development of a state education system has been an unambiguously progressive process consisting of the provision, in stages, of a self-evidently necessary service." (In Donajgrodzki, p.77) The relation between the State and capitalism revealed by Harrison and Mort, Corrigan, [1980] writing about property relations shows how successful this sort of analysis without recourse to the notion of social control.

7. The term "laissez-faire" is often used to contrast the 18th Century with the interventionist 19th Century. E.P. Thompson, however, pointed out that the capitalist farmers and landlords had a large role to play in the destruction of "the old moral economy". Corrigan also says that to contrast Laissez-faire with state control is a mistaken contrast, "since even laissez-faire capitalism depends, for the condition of its existence, upon the bourgeois state." (1980a, xxiii)
8. See Gramsci *Prison Notebooks*, also R. Gray in Bennett et al, [1981].
9. Elias says:

... the greater the importance in the moulding of the people of the more even constraints that come to the fore in society when the representatives of the monopoly of physical violence normally only exercise their control as it were standing in the wings - the further, in a word, the civilization of conduct advances. (1982, Vol.2, p.293)

10. The 'core' referred to here must be the British Museum as the other large London museums and provincial public museums were established in the 19th Century.

11. Autobiographies reveal a great deal about the writer and this too must be taken into account. Joseph Gutteridge, the weaver, [see Chapter 5], writing in his mellow and more religious old age, denied the part he played in a riot when he was young.
12. There are some useful ideas in Hearn's book, [1978], for example, his belief in the importance of imagination and nostalgia and in the positive aspects of movements such as Luddism. His ideas on working class incorporation are, however, what E.P. Thompson would call part of the Fabian tradition. Hobsbawm too, expresses something of this, quoting from an old Chartist in 1872 who laments the lack of groups of men who were poor, but interested in political ideas:

Now you will see no such groups in Lancashire. But you will hear well dressed working men talking as they walk with their hands in their pockets, of "Co-ops" and their shares in them ... And you will see others, like idiots leading small greyhound dogs. [Hobsbawm, 1979, p.126]

13. As an antidote to this the work of recent feminist historians would help. Bea Campbell's *Vigan Pier Revisited*, [p.198] puts forward the position of working class women, their ideas, working life, and so on.
14. According to Marcuse, value judgements are necessary so that "a specific historical practice is measured against its own historical alternatives. [1968 , p.10] Thus, he continues, social theory is critical theory which "is concerned with the historical alternatives which haunt the established society as subversive tends and forces." [p.11]
15. Corrigan does not presume to speak for Wales or Scotland.
16. Corrigan, [1980a, xxv-xxvii] also tries to place himself as a male academic and acknowledges the lack of women historians in his book. Academic life moreover, separates the writer from "the general public whose activity actually sustains academia!" Personalised careers are made (including his own). He quotes from M. Barrett et al, *Ideology and Cultural Production*, 1979, where arguments are put against the creation of heroes and the attacks of rival theories to promote "a series of individual - predominantly male, white, middle class - reputations." [p.16] They also argue for working *groups* as a possibility.
R. Johnson, [Clarke et al, 1979, p.47] relates the above to the Webbs', whose intellectual work was greatly aided by domestic servants who did the manual chores. Gramsci, too, warns against intellectuals feeling superior to others because they believe they have 'The knowledge' whereas in reality the skilled worker is "indispensable ... and ... a hundred times more valuable in his activity than they (intellectuals) are in theirs." [*Selections from the Political Writings 1910-20* pp.11-13. Quoted in Bennett et al, 197, p.193]

CHAPTER 1.

Charity	27.
Policing	38.
Some Ideas on the State	53.
Education	57.
The Education Department	73.
Central and Local Rule	90.
Class and the State	93.
Notes	98.

This chapter is concerned with middle class solutions to social or working class problems and the debates surrounding a topic which, judging by 19th Century literature, appears to have been of burning importance. Whether it was called 'The condition of England' question or was expressed more forcefully as a fear of revolution, the issue was central to those problems generated or exacerbated by the Industrial Revolution. Urban life was becoming more and more concentrated and widespread. Although, as can be seen from Engels' description of Manchester of 1844, the middle classes conducted their business in the town, they tended to live 'on the hill', away from the smoke and used thoroughfares which hid the grimy working class dwellings from where they might offend. Writing of Bethnal Green, the preacher Mr. G. Alston reported; "I believe that before the Bishop of London called attention to this most poverty stricken parish, people at the West-End knew as little of it as the savages of Australia or the South Sea Isles."

Putting aside this 'imperialist' attitude for the time being, what the middle class did know about (even if they were unaware of the realities), was that the working classes existed and were or could be a threat to the established economic and social order. The fear of revolution or 'social catastrophe' is prominent in much of the journalism, social reports, and novels of the 19th century. Fear was an attitude often accompanied by distaste and to some extent this can be seen as a tacit recognition of the precariousness and hardship of working class life which *could* lead to revolt. Dissatisfaction therefore had to be

personalised so that the ethic of individualism and individual responsibility was a way of deflecting criticism away from its real target and onto oneself. There were times when the ideology broke down and working class people realised that the 'sense of wrong' they felt was due to forces not entirely of their making. There were strikes and bitterness when it was obvious that often hard work still meant hard times. Collective self-help was one way of coping and caring within capitalism and what E.P. Thompson calls the 'sub-culture', e.g. songs, was an expression of their life by working class people.

The justification for inequality was then, as it is now, a supposedly natural order of merits and demerits associated with the qualities of individuals. Bad luck might be acknowledged but persistent poverty was thought to be the result of laziness. *The Penny Magazine*, a middle class paper written for working class people illustrates this attitude. In 1832 there was an article on "Labouring Man's Dwelling". There was, said the writer, more 'snug little houses' than before, due to the increase in population and such a "choice of dwellings, it is very much a labouring man's fault if he does not have a commodious one..."[15.4.32 No.2, p. 15] Although "It is possible that an industrious and careful family may, for some time, be obliged to live in a wretched house; ...it is their own fault if they continue in it. In this country the poor are better lodged than in any other in Europe..."

Here is another example of the idea of working class people as savages:

They live precisely like brutes, to gratify ... the appetites of their uncultivated bodies, and then die, to go they have never thought, cared, or wondered whither, Brought up in the darkness of barbarism they have no idea, that it is possible for them to attain any higher condition in life,

[*The Problem of Working Class Leisure*; R.D. Storch in Donajrodski 1977 and quoted from Jos. Kay *Social Condition and Education*, pp. 580-1]

This attitude is reminiscent of Prospero and Caliban in *The Tempest* but in that case the teacher of 'culture' and morality regrets having raised the beast above his station civilising him and teaching him to speak.

The working classes were defined as a problem but the solution to it was disputed. In very broad terms, the debate ranged from a belief in non-interference by government to state action where necessary. In the former, although there was a recognition of the dangers of insurrection, there was a feeling that ignorance enhanced control and that non-interference was consistent with self-reliance and would keep down taxes and generally be conducive to the efficiency of business. Cobbett was himself against intervention by government because it would mean domination. Some were for measures directly beneficial to themselves such as a police force or better sanitation but against the principle of government growth.

Amongst the latter the approach was control through reason. Concessions like education were to be given otherwise there was a fear that they would be taken. Limited intervention where it is proven necessary and no more, such as the Poor Law was a part of this tutelary attitude.

Donajrodzki in his essay *Social Policy and the Bureaucratic Elite* (1977, pp. 51...) uses the examples of Hugh Tremeneheere described as a traditionalist and Bentham's follower and one-time secretary Edwin Chadwick to show how the two seemingly opposing approaches, on closer

examination, have virtually identical social values. The underlying assumption of both was that the -

... social order was the product of a common morality which was sustained and expressed by its general diffusion throughout the institutions of society, Thus a social policy which aimed at the preservation of order must include not only consideration of legal systems, police forces and prisons, but of religion and morality and of those factors which supported and propagated them,

(Donajgrodzki, 1977, p. 52)

These were to include education, socially constructive leisure, housing and public health. Both traditionalists like Tremeneheere and 'moderate' reformers like Chadwick believed in the usefulness of personal contact - the tenet of 18th century class relations. The rich had a duty to supervise the poor using restraint where necessary. The paternalism of the 18th century now has a colonial flavour. As one writer put it in 1820 they thought that "... the opinions of that class of the people below the middle rank are formed and their minds directed by that intelligent and virtuous rank who come the most immediately into contact with them." (Asa Briggs, 1956, from J.S. Mill)

Tremeneheere placed his main emphasis on the stability of the family and sentimental ties as devices for achieving social order with the church and the police playing a tutelary role. They would regulate family happiness through such measures as restricting the sale of alcohol. Chadwick also appreciated that order was the result of diffuse social control processes and is one reason for the emphasis on personal contact between the classes. Some state intervention was necessary because organised control meant efficiency. Having concluded that the middle classes had a duty or social responsibility Chadwick thought that action was the next step. He states this clearly in his *Preventive Police*

in which he advocates the setting up of a metropolitan police force. There were, however, other methods of preventive policing both positive and negative and which in practice appeared autonomous. One form which furnished the class contact but lacked efficiency was the use of charity.

Charity

Charity according to the laws of political economy was really helping those who should be helping themselves and who should not expect help. And yet, by going against these natural laws they were being reinforced and Christian ideals being seen to be enacted. Christian ethics and moral superiority joined together in the soup kitchen. Sometimes, charities embodied the paternal pre-industrial relationship between master and servant and echoed the harvest supper. Dinners for the poor generally happened at Christmas. In Sussex, Lord Egremont held annual fetes at Petworth and in 1836 the local paper reported that '3000 women and children sat down to a profusion of the old English fare, roast beef and plum puddings. The men received no invitation in consequence of some irregularities which had been committed by them at the previous fete.' (J. Lowerson & J. Myerscough^{77p.99}) This same Lord had shown that he was not unaware of his responsibilities by instigating emigration schemes which had 'removed so many potential troublemakers to the colonies.'

From the 1830's when the extent of urban poverty was being revealed through social investigations and so forth, the number of charities increased so that, for example, there were 640 in London alone in 1861

with an annual income, which, when taken together exceeded that spent on the Poor Law. Frazer points out that as the approach of the charities was pragmatic and reflected the market economy in that it was unplanned, it led to inefficiencies and waste.

Charity, its means and its ends, were criticised by working class writers and sympathisers and it eventually became obvious that many urban problems could not be solved by philanthropy. James Hole, the associationist, stated that private philanthropy was utterly inadequate and that "Alms to sots and premiums to vagabonds tend to drag down the artisan. The various forms of charity are good as acknowledging some bond between man and man besides interest, and as indicating and often alleviating the evils of the present system; but as *remedies* they are worthless." (J.F.C. Harrison 1961 p.22). A similar view was expressed by another working class writer a few years earlier. William Lovett, in less equivocal terms, talking about how the government should provide education for 'the whole nation':

We trust we have, in some degree, succeeded in showing the great importance of education, and the necessity of *Publicly* extending it; not as a charity, BUT AS A RIGHT, derivable from society itself ...

Independent of which, *charity*, by diminishing the energies of self-dependence, creates a spirit of hypocrisy and servility all just governments should seek to prevent,

(Lovett 1920 Vol.1, 142)

Charity is thus not only inadequate, but also patronising, paralysing and oppressive. Art, too, has been identified as a type of charity. (Baranik et al, 1977, p.24). When the rich donate collections to public museums or when they open up private collections, Baranik et al see this as charity evoking a "response of gratitude" and say it is:

The concept that colors and obscures how we see the feast, Charity makes invisible the real source of the wealth - the human labor that created the food and the treasure, Charity makes us believe that this wealth was magically generated by the patron alone, or as John D. Rockefeller 1 accounted for it: 'God gave me my money,' (Baranik et al, 1977, p.24-25)

This can be seen in Chapter 5 above with men like George Beaumont who donated works to the National Gallery and obtained the money to collect works of art from coal mines on his Leicestershire estate. Those who donate have their name on the label in a museum and their name associated with the worth or works given. Charles Townley, who donated many ancient marbles to The British Museum in the early 19th Century, had the room built to house them named after him. The Elgin Marbles is another case in point.

Some sections of the middle-class frowned upon charity as an affront to individual responsibility and as the creator of expectations and dependence in the worker where there should be none. This criticism of dependence, however, should not be confused with Lovett's criticism of dependence; one criticises as a giver and the other as receiver. It is, however, Engels who is probably the most vitriolic in his attacks on charity and the middle-classes:

Let no-one believe, however, that the 'cultivated' Englishman openly brags with his egotism. On the contrary, he conceals it under the vilest hypocrisy. What? The wealthy fail to remember the poor? They who have founded philanthropic institutions, such as no other country can boast of! Philanthropic institutions forsooth! As though you rendered the proletarians a service in first sucking out their life-blood and then practising your self-complacent, Pharisaic philanthropy upon them, placing yourselves before the world as mighty benefactors of humanity when you give back to the plundered victims the hundredth part of what belongs to them! Charity which degrades him who gives more than him who takes; charity which treads the downtrodden still deeper in the dust, which demands that the downgraded, the pariah cast out by society, shall first surrender the last that remains to him ... before your mercy deigns to press, in the shape of an alms, the brand of degradation on his brow. But let us hear the English bourgeoisie's own words. It is not yet a year since I read in the Manchester

Guardian the following letter to the editor, which was published without comment as a perfectly natural, reasonable thing:

MR, EDITOR - For some time past our main streets are haunted by swarms of beggars, who try to awaken the pity of the passers-by in a most shameless and annoying manner, by exposing their tattered clothing, sickly aspect, and disgusting wounds and deformities. I should think that when one not only pays the poor-rate, but also contributes largely to the charitable institutes, one had done enough to learn a right to be spared such disagreeable and impertinent molestations. And why else do we pay such high rates for the maintenance of the municipal police, if they do not even protect us so far as to make it possible to go to or out of town in peace? ...

Your obedient servant,

'A LADY',

There you have it! The English bourgeoisie is charitable out of self-interest,

(Engels, 1969, p.303-304)

He continues, describing middle-class charity as a sort of business transaction or bargain struck with the poor so that they will 'despair unseen'. (Engels also notes the point made by Canon Parkinson in *On the Present Condition of the Labouring Poor in Manchester* a pamphlet of 1841 - that the poor very often helped each other more than the charity they received.)

Many more recent historians have commented on the middle-classes' guilt feeling associated with philanthropy in the 19th Century. Frazer says that charitable work helped the donor as much as the recipient and combined a 'humanitarian religious concern' with 'self-conscious guilt-complexes about the possession of wealth' and was as described by Beatrice Webb a 'class-consciousness of sin.' (Frazer p.118) So, apart from the dose of valued respectability it gave, it 'provided a massive system of relief alternative to, or it could be supportive to, the Poor Law system' (Eric Hopkins 1979, p.140). J.F.C. Harrison suggests that guilt was implicit in most middle-class/working -class relations and that 'Clothing clubs, soup kitchens, and *adult education* were alike products, in

some degree, of this relationship. (My emphasis Harrison, 1961, p.159). Beyond this 'guilt' was also the 'Condition of England Question' and the use of charity as an insurance against 'social catastrophe'. As early as 1797 Colquhoun was saying that charity should be used in times of surplus to promote law and order and that crime is fostered by ill-education and want (Donajrodski, 1977, p.59, from *Account of a Meat and Soup Charity, Estab. in the Metropolis in the year 1797* by P. Colquhoun.)

The idea of visiting charities such as the Anglican Metropolitan Visiting Relief Association of 1843 promoted these ideals and the personal contact could, it was felt, do nothing but good. The latter would foster cleanliness and prudence as a type of 'social regenerator' it would be an education for the poor. (C.S. Loch; Charity Organisation reporter in 1884 and quoted in Frazer, 1976, p.119.) Many charity workers were women and Frazer says,

For many a leisured (and probably bored) wife or spinster, charity had its recreational and creative aspects. It could be a very satisfying experience and, as one titled lady recalled after a touching deathbed reunion with an old man she had been visiting, 'These little incidents make 'slumming' a real pleasure. One can give so much happiness with so little trouble.'
[Quoted from B. Harrison *Vict. Studies* IX 360, 1966 by Frazer, 1976, p.118]

It must be said, however, that much of the work undertaken by charities was of the sort thought most fitted to women - food preparation, children, clothing etc.

Despite apparent prosperity among the charities the actual conditions of the poor did not appear to have changed. It was reasoned that charity had produced in the poor a scrounger mentality and did not encourage self-betterment. Moreover it was seen as unscientific and

wasteful as it gave without discrimination. It had "intrinsic organisational deficiencies" so that "By its very nature - reliance on the fluctuating interest of local benefactors - philanthropy was flawed". (R. Johnson 'Educating and Educators' in Donajgrodski, 1977, p.94)

The Charity Organisation Society (C.O.S.), a group of well-to-do individuals, whose committees consisted of doctors, lawyers, retired army officers and the like was established in 1869. It hoped to be part of a scientific attempt at the remoralisation of the poor. (Judith Fido 'The C.O.S. & Social Casework in London 1869-1906' in Donajgrodski, 1977). From the outset its efforts were organised with the Poor Law in mind. In each Poor Law division the C.O.S. set up committee charity offices to coordinate the activities of all the charities and the Poor Law. The original aim had been to make lists of the needy and then to refer them to the appropriate charity but it soon became an intermediate stage between the Poor Law and survival (it could do things that the Poor Law could not eg., redeem pawned articles and buy tools) and began to take on casework.

Judith Fido states that the practices of the C.O.S. were born of the theories that they upheld - "... organisation should be an integral part of the charitable impulse, one which substituted controlled and conditional help for the spontaneous and careless gift" (p. 212). In order to assess if a needy person was needy enough and responsible enough to warrant the effort meant a system of investigation and specialised committees to deal with different categories. The C.O.S. as a charity wished to obviate the need for state action and promote self-reliance. By the time people had become 'eligible' for the workhouse they were beyond the help the C.O.S. wanted to offer.

Enquiries would consist of home visits, letters to employers and chats to neighbours about the claimant's character. If a claimant belonged to a trade or benefit club it was noted down as a good sign of thrift and prudence. Often assistance was denied to those who refused to answer questions. Fido describes these home visits as a cultural assault on the working class way of life and they were patently resented by many. Because aid had been sought it was assumed that there was 'carte blanche' to visit by those in a better position. (Donajrodzki, 1977, p.221)

The assumption underlying this situation was that those in need were or had been in a position to execute totally free and rational decisions (just as in the labour market) and so "The ideal of character was related to those attributes which ensure the smooth operation of market forces." (Donajrodzki, 1977, p.222)

There was also an emphasis on family responsibility and aid from relations. (The C.O.S. eventually became the Family Welfare Association.) We have also seen this tendency in the opinions of Chadwick and Tremeneheere.

Frazer describes the C.O.S. as "professionally pioneering but ideologically reactionary" (p.121) and the professional structure it created formed the basis for later social work developments. And:

... though the worst fears of the C.O.S. materialised in the form of state provided social services, the personalised welfare relationship in which they so passionately believed has flourished in the Welfare State. Through this relationship, the social worker reminds the applicant of his dependency and his social obligations.
[J. Fido, in Donajrodzki, 1977, p.228]

Jones and Novak also note that the C.O.S. developed a "modus operandi" which included techniques to deal with clients. "Approach" is important,

for as the C.O.S. monthly magazine said in 1895 "the strategy is intended to persuade people to change their attitudes, their way of life and attendant values ..." [From *Charity Organisation Review* 1895, p.144. Corrigan (1980a) p.160]. Stedman-Jones (1983: p.191) calls charity the use of "The material needs of the poor as a means towards their moral reform." What Stedman-Jones calls "benevolence ... by proxy" was part of the physical separations between rich and poor and the concomitant lack of personal acquaintance.

The C.O.S., however, was, according to Booth, disliked in the East End, for people hated its methods, theories, and he calls their efforts "disappointing". (from *Life and Labour*, series 3, Vol. 2, 52)

The Poor Law was, of course, another example of the tutelary ideology. Deterrence was more directly a part of it but it still showed a "synthesis of contemporary opinion" in the Poor Law Report 1834 even though the Poor Law Amendment Act which followed was to some degree (more in theory than practice) a measure of increasing central government control. The emphasis was on a 'limited eligibility .' Outside relief was to be discouraged and the alternative, the workhouse, made so unpalatable as to make the poor more enterprising and self-reliant. In general, the Poor Law revealed the impracticability of no government action and as one writer put it, if capital and labour could best protect their own interests the Poor Law had no need to exist at all. [J. Hole 'Lectures on Soc. Science and the Org. Of Lab.' 1851 - J.F.C. Harrison 1961, p.1211.

It was the loophole for Utilitarianism and a recognition by Chadwick and others that the misery of a few was inevitable and even necessary to the happiness of the majority. To give aid in money as I said, would, they reasoned, have demoralised the working class and yet the workhouses

themselves (or the bastilles, as later establishments were called) separated the married couples with their rule on sex segregation and mixed the well and infirm, the former often having to subsist on a diet designed for the latter. Solitary confinement was used to punish transgressors of rules. When times were very hard, systems of work for the unemployed were arranged such as picking oakum and stonebreaking but local boards were often reluctant to operate them as it would have meant employing extra overseers.

Gradually, "Fear of the workhouse became part of popular folklore". (Frazer, 1976, p.47) Ruskin, writing about a news item from the *Telegraph* of 1867 where a man had died through a lack of the basic necessities, stated:

"Why would witness (the man's wife at the inquest) not go into the workhouse?" you ask, Well, the poor seem to have a prejudice against the workhouse which the rich have not; for of course everyone who takes a pension from Government goes into the workhouse on a grand scale; only the workhouses for the rich do not involve the idea of work ... But the poor like to die independently it appears; ... we make our relief either so insulting to them, or so painful, that they rather die than take it at our hands ...

[Ruskin 1906; p.84]

This attitude was not uncommon. Charles Shaw, whose family were sent to the "Bastille" at Chell, says the phrase "to go to Chell" was often used in those days in bitterness and contempt and loathing. (Shaw 1983, p.84). The word "Chell" had "a metallic harshness in its utterance" and Shaw says: "I know I ought to have been grateful for my country's institutions, but ingratitude is a stubborn factor in all "ill-regulated minds." (Shaw, 1983, p.85)

M.E. Rose, in an essay called *Rochdale Man and the Stalybridge Riot* tells of what happened during the period of exceptionally high

unemployment in Lancashire in the early 1860's and how the authorities coped. [In Donajgrotski 1977, pp. 185-206]. It was important because it presented philanthropy and poor relief with a challenge for which they had no real answer except through exceptional central legislation.

The hardships of the Lancashire working-classes happened at a time when the servants of the poor boards were facing pressure from a government select committee set up to scrutinise its activities since the East End distress of 1860-1. There was a fear that if seen to be inefficient, it would add fuel to the argument for abolition of 'central control of poor relief.' Fear came not only from those who might find themselves unemployed as civil servants, but also from Poor Law inspectors, magistrates, the clergy, philanthropists and social and political commentators. The scale of unemployment was as much as 32,000 out of a workforce of 56,000 in one union, with over 25% of its population on relief. It was expected by the Poor Law authorities that private charity would step in even though they feared that the unemployed would thus be furnished with a life of idleness and spend the money in the pub. By the Outdoor Relief Order 1852, the able-bodied could get no money without some form of work in return and had to receive at least one half of it in kind. This usually amounted to no more than 1 or 2 shillings a week which was not enough without as it expected, family or charitable help. Work could not be organised for most of them which caused the Lancashire Poor Law inspector to protest, but he was informed by the Poor Law Board that there was no need to be concerned as the amount given was too low to present any danger of demoralising them.

In 1862, two relief committees were set up which merged into the Central Executive Relief Committee headed by Lord Derby and twenty-six

businessmen and men with landed interests. (The vicechairman was Dr. Kay Shuttleworth ex-poor law assistant commissioner, social investigator and educational 'expert' and who Rose describes as bringing his brand of "liberal individualism and elitist control" to the proceedings.)

This philanthropic effort organised home visits and was later hailed as an inspiration to the C.O.S. They arranged educational classes for the men and boys and sewing classes for the women to help them spend their unwanted leisure and to ensure "surveillance in a disciplined environment" (Donajgrodzki, 1977, p192)

Some poor law unions cooperated in this effort but it was in Stalybridge that there were complaints that the relief committee was like the board of guardians and the unemployed held a meeting. They declared that they did not agree with the compulsory nature of the classes (which they said would have been agreeable otherwise) and with the "distrust of their behaviour". The riot was precipitated by the decision to cut the money and to pay in tickets. Windows were smashed, food stolen from a committee member's shop and when the army and special constables were brought in there were twenty-nine arrests resulting in prison sentences of between one and six months. One commentator said of the riot "They have in a great many instances demanded as a right what they formerly received as a favour." (Quoted from Mr. Osram a sub-inspector of factories, Donajgrodzki, 1977, p193)

The relief committees were accused of keeping workers 'on ice' and were compared to the southern farmers who in 1834 had been criticised by the Poor Law Commission Report for keeping labourers on the parish "like potatoes in a pit". Similar thoughts surrounded the idea of emigration as a solution, for, if the cotton trade picked up and labour

was in short supply it could dictate terms. Temporary occupation was the answer and the Public Works (Manufacturing Districts) Bill had a relatively easy passage through Parliament, July 1863. Although the attitude towards the bill was cautious M.E. Rose suggests that its passage showed that the discontent of the unemployed had revealed the failure of private philanthropy and poor relief. By 1865 when the central committee was dissolved, with a huge surplus left, it was stated that pauperism was now "reduced to the ordinary level". (from Central Cttee. Report 4 Dec. '65 Manchester Cent. Reference Political Tracts p. 3339, in Donajgrodzki, 1977, p201)

Stalybridge had, however, challenged the "minimal", "disciplined" and "discriminatory" relief. The above measures, related to pauperism, highlight the contradictions in the individualist morality of political economy. (See Ch 5 above) The creation of a police force, discussed in the following section, does this too however it also did not stop crime and disorder.

Policing

When Colquhoun a London Magistrate was writing his *Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis* in 1806 he found it an easy step from order to morality. Donajdrodzki, 1977, p54-5) In 1829, Chadwick proposed in his report *Preventive Police* that a metropolitan force be set up. It was the culmination of years of debate and came after a period of repressive legislation (eg., Combination Acts and the Six Acts; see Hearn, 1978,

p.98.) at a time when many working class activities were being classified as criminal and disorderly. There had been reports on the policing of the metropolis on a number of occasions since the beginning of the 19th. century but the weight of argument had mostly been behind the opinion that the advantages of a systematic and organised police force were outweighed by the lack of freedom that would ensue. The emphasis of Chadwick's argument was placed on the need for a more scientific approach in the detection of crime. The existing nightwatch was inadequate for many reasons including the fact that their movements were too predictable and could be seen from quite a distance by the lantern they carried. This scientific approach was, he suggested, to be so efficient that it would act as a deterrent and increase the exertion necessary to obtain property illegally. A preventive police would work in everyone's favour; the rich and the criminal. Those with property would be spared loss and those who might be tempted to steal would be prevented from doing so by a tightening of security and thus a lack of opportunity. (He believed that greater prevention meant a diminution of motive!) The danger of being caught would deter as would the example of others so that "the escape of one delinquent must do more mischief than perhaps half a dozen guilty men can effect good, in the way of an example." (Chadwick, 1830, pp.301-302) Chadwick praises the increase in benefit societies which "advance the habits of temperance and frugality, the concomitants of honesty." and thus 'police' their members. The mixture of science and morality Chadwick expresses emerges in the recognition of, and, stated need for, both formal and informal methods of policing. He says that magistrates should have "an acquaintance with the habits and courses of life of delinquents". Psychological as well

as scientific facts should be built up either from the defendants themselves or from friends and relatives. One example of the 'informal' approach in detection would be the seeking out of 'flash houses'.

We are, however, left in no doubt who will benefit from a more efficient police force. (Chadwick's first mention of the social sanction of a police is justified by the 'primitive instinct' to protect property.) The moral justification and philosophy behind a police force is stated quite clearly. The middle class must recognise and act out its social responsibility to create social sanctions which will result in a peace to enable society to be prosperous. Chadwick quotes from Fielding, "Nor in plain truth, will the utmost severity to offenders be justifiable, unless we take every possible means of preventing the offence." [p.307] Echoes still of the paternalist attitudes of Colquhoun,

An immoral man can never be a good citizen. Yet, true it is, that we should have little reason to complain of the inferior ranks of the community, if more attention were bestowed to form proper regulations for their support and improvement in society. If we suffer them to be ill-educated, and then punish them for those very crimes to which their bad education and miserable condition exposed them, the result is, that by such an oversight we make delinquents, and then punish them. [From P. Colquhoun, *A New and Appropriate System of Education for the Labouring People etc*, London 1806 p.70 quoted by Donaigrodski (1977) p. 54]

Although the prevailing view of government activity was "that he who legislates best legislates least" [p. 400. *Vict. Social Conscience Series* Vol. 1 1973 introduced by C.J. Wrigley from 'The WESTMINSTER Review' Vol. 18 1833 pp. 380-404] The responsibility of the middle classes was recognised and realised in the perceived need and establishing of an institutional framework of law and order that would efficiently enable economic freedom. The fear among the upper classes of

social unrest contributed to their acceptance of the taking away of a small amount of liberty for the sake of the greater liberty. Hearn goes as far as to say that the new police force was in fact a bureaucratic insulation of the middle classes from popular violence using the police (as a 'neutral' and 'protective' force for good in society) as something 'apart' from them who would draw animosity instead of themselves. Further, this was a separation of constitutional authority from more direct economic and social domination and in the absence of a "normative framework of obligations", "domination began to be legitimated to the extent that it permitted economic growth." [Hearn, 1978, p.98]

This shift towards a 'positive' legislation to the extent that it facilitated the market entailed a greater degree of centralisation of government. One reason for this need was to ensure efficient use of resources. Chadwick gives an example of a national group, the 'Society for the Protection of Trade', formed to protect businesses against fraud and points to its efficiency. He cites examples of how criminals got away with crimes by moving or running to new areas not under the jurisdiction of the police of the the place where the crime was committed, which left them powerless to pursue. There should, he says, be a central system of information stretching right up to the Home Secretary [Chadwick 1830 p.282] and along with a comprehensive policing there should be the court which would command more respect than "this or that court". Lady Simon describes the development of the police in Manchester especially in the 1930's and 1940's which highlights some of the points made above, for example about property and centralisation.

The question of changes in the policing forces and methods came to a head in Manchester in the late 1930's when there was a local

government dispute. It followed the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act which proposed to stamp out corruption and inefficiency revealed by the Royal Commission's report. It substituted existing corporations by a body which was supposed to be elected by popular vote rather than self-election. (As Lady Simon points out (1938 pp.428-39) it was less democratic than the 1832 electorate for various complex reasons including more stringent residence and rate qualifications but was advertised in 1838 by Cobden in the Manchester Guardian as 'universal suffrage'.)

She calls the pre-1838 government of Manchester 'whimsical' and mostly unplanned. It was "partly manorial, partly parochial, partly the creation of recent Acts of Parliament." with its five tier system of jurisdiction. It had retained "by some mediaeval accident" a manorial Court Leet rather than having a corporation and mayor as in Liverpool. The Lord of the manor spent most of his time in Staffordshire and his interest was confined to that of revenue. It met every three weeks as a small debts court administering "expensive justice to the poor" and twice a year to choose officials. The offices of Borough Reeve and the two constables were nominal. The latter were responsible for the day police force with a deputy constable and thirty men whose expenses were paid from the poor rate! The Borough Reeve was a sort of mayor - a prominent citizen who represented the town, administered charities and presided over various ad hoc committees, for example a special Board of Health set up to deal with the cholera epidemic 1831-3. Both offices were of a years duration. Other officers appointed included the unsalaried posts (you were fined if you did not accept):

... Justices of the Peace - Market Lookers for Fish and Flesh, Inspectors of White Meat, Officers to prevent Engrossing, Regrating and Forstalling, Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Market Looker for

the Assize of Bread, Officers for Tasting Wholesome Ale and Beer,
Byelaw men, Officers for Muzzling Mastiff Dogs, and a Pounder,
(Lady Simon, 1938, P41)

Apart from the Court Leet's top officials there were the Churchwardens and the Overseers, the Police Improvement Commissioners, the Surveyors of Highways and the Justice of Peace for the County. The basis of local government was, as it had been since Elizabethan times, the parish which was a universal division in the country and the foundation of the rating system. The Churchwardens and Overseers were elected by the population at large at meetings in the Parish Church and in 1838 there was a shift towards using the town hall for political business. Their responsibilities were to the church and the poor; they levied and administered the poor rate.

The Police and Improvement Commissioners were a relatively new body set up under a special Act of Parliament in 1792 to provide a night force. (It was separate from the day police which had its own salaried chief.) They were part of a movement of the 18th. and early 19th. centuries of "public-spirited citizens" throughout Britain who formed themselves into groups of Commissioners, and could include any occupier who paid a yearly Poor Rate of £30, and who came forward and took an oath. As attendance could attract over eight hundred Commissioners in times of agitation, numbers were limited to two hundred and forty in 1828 elected by those rated at £16 who had paid rates the previous year. They also, in 1817, began the manufacture of gas for street lighting and private use pre-empting Chadwick's preventive Police, in which he quotes from a 4th Republic magistrate who said, "I consider gas... essential to an enlightened police." [Chadwick, 1830, 285] They were disbanded after

Incorporation and the powers of their local acts handed to the town council.

The Court Leet of October 1837 was to prove crucial in the lead up to its demise. Then it was that Cobden was summoned as juror and William Neild elected Borough Reeve against his will. Both were to be active in the support of municipal reform. Cobden described the experience in *Incorporate Your Borough* in which he says he had the 'amusing fate' to be juror. [The next passage is taken from Cobden's *Incorporate...* and quoted in Lady Simon, 1938, pp.41-4.]

The meeting began with a declaration that the inhabitants of Manchester, now 180,000 were each fined 3d. for non-attendance and the Crier let out an "unintelligible jargon of Saxon, Old English and Norman epithets." And,

Whilst these preliminaries were going on I looked over the enclosure which, I supposed, was designated to separate the crowd of spectators from the jurors, and I counted, besides the constables, exactly seven individuals and they, one by one, walked listlessly away, leaving the jurors only in the deserted and murky chamber; and we now proceeded to make the choice of three persons to fill the offices of the boroughreeve and constables of Manchester - a task in which we greatly quickened by the piercing cold vapour with which the apartment was filled, Having dispatched messengers to the individuals nominated, summoning them to appear in the afternoon, to be sworn into office, we separated. At the appointed hour the court and the jurors again assembled, when the gentleman who had been nominated to the office of the boroughreeve and claimed to be exempted on the grounds of ill-health and previous service. The jurors protested that there was not another person in the town liable, and at the same time eligible, to fill this high office. Some little difference of opinion existing, however, we requested permission to retire, and were conducted through a room into a closet under the stairs, in which were deposited the bonnets, shawls, cloaks and clogs of the nymphs who were threading the mazes of the quadrille and waltz in the dancing academy above. Here some stood, while others sat, and the remainder stooped beneath the stairs, till our deliberations, which were not a little accelerated by our incommodious quarters, were brought to a close, and we returned into court with a verdict against the claims to exemption put in by the boroughreeve elect, who thereupon was declared contumacious, and fined £200 (which was afterwards remitted). Our choice fell upon an individual absent from Manchester, and the court adjourned for two

days that he might have time to appear. On reassembling at the appointed time he presented himself to protest against nomination; but he yielded reluctantly, and the honour was at last gently forced upon him. The two individuals chosen constables were also unwillingly compelled to take the oaths of office. The crier soon afterwards formally adjourned the court to the Mosley Arms Hotel for dinner, at which all present laughed heartily; and thus terminated the farce of a mock election of officers to govern the affairs of the town of Manchester.

Cobden continues in critical vein deploring the fact that he had no knowledge of those he was electing and the apparent reluctance with which all parties concerned seem to perform their duties coupled with the indifference of the public. (He says that "not one in ten thousand of the population of Manchester" attended - that number which he considers low, 20,000, just over twice the number allowed to vote in municipal elections, after incorporation and nearly twice the parliamentary vote!) Although Lady Simon believes that Cobden was genuinely mistaken in his 'universal suffrage' electorate at municipal level bearing in mind that in *Incorporate Your Borough* the issue is presented as democracy versus feudalism.

In 1838 the new council met after fierce opposition. It included Cobden and Neild and was made up of Whigs and leading businessmen. The Tories had boycotted the elections for the newly incorporated Manchester. They had done all in their power to prevent the prior vote about incorporation itself - held in the Town Hall and carried by a large majority. Opposition also came from the Radicals and here we have, in a local example, a cross-section of the various positions on government.

The Tory position was stated emphatically again and again in their anti-incorporation publicity. The following extracts are taken from

posters imploring working men not to attend the town meeting at which incorporation was accepted.

WORKING MEN, BEWARE

The Whigs are at their dirty work again,
We must have no middle class government ...
No new police ... No Cotton-Lord Mayors ...
No wine cellars stored out of the New Borough Rate in addition to
present Police Rate.
The Whigs are not our friends, their reform tends to establish a
shopocracy to rush over and grind down the Poor,

REMEMBER!

... Who sent the London Policemen to Cold Bath Fields Bradford, and
Huddersfield as spies?

The Poor Law Whigs,

Who sent the London Police and Government reporter to Manchester to
watch the working man's friends, and to write down treason?

The Manchester Whigs,

Who are the main supporters of these mean, dirty ... malthusian, Poor
Law Whigs?

The Incorporate Your Borough Patriot,

(Lady Simon, 1938, p81)

This is clever usage of propaganda for their own ends but filtered through a working class angle. The "robbery by taxation" following more government, could, said the Tories, be turned into government repression.

The Radicals who generally turned out later to be Chartists, were also bitterly opposed to the Whigs because of their new Poor Law, their betrayal in the 1832 Reform Bill and their suspicion of the support by the businessmen for a more efficient police force "for in those days the police were considered, and with justice, as a weapon of the well-to-do to used against the poor." (Lady Simon, 1938, p74)

For the Whigs, security, duty and efficiency were practical realities to be effected only through a middle class government without patronage by 'practical men.' The new council consisted of sixty-four men of whom

thirty-four were merchants and manufacturers and ten were shopkeepers and who were "self-made men, at a time when fortunes could be made more easily and more quickly than at almost any other period of our history, they had also a strong sense of public duty. Some of them had been Police Commissioners" (Lady Simon, 1938, p395) Coles and Postgate describe the situation throughout England after the 1835 Act as a replacing of Anglicans and Tories by "councillors who were as often as not Dissenting Shopkeepers ..." (1966, p272-3)

Even after 1838 the Tories did not easily give up their 'rights' and there were years of bitter wrangling over the relinquishing of power. Tactics included lawsuits and attempts to carry on their previous duties regardless. (Oswald Milne, a Tory owner of a legal firm who had done a lucrative business for more than forty years for various public bodies fought against the council with its new legal adviser. He was believed to have been the clerk to the magistrates who advised them to send in the yeomen at Peterloo and thus attracted personal antipathy. An incident which led eventually to the validation by law of the charter of incorporation concerned the new Borough Coroner. When the first inquest was to be held after incorporation, the Constables refused to call a jury for him and when he summoned one himself and went to the Infirmary he found the old County Coroner, a Mr. Rutter, already there finishing his task and having the coffin screwed down. The coffin was then ordered to be reopened by the Borough Coroner and another inquest held. Rutter had been advised in this matter by Milne and it was taken to court to test the validity of the charter. This took until 1842.)

Incorporation also caused struggles in the police forces. The day and night forces should have been disbanded when in 1839, the council

appointed a joint day and night force under a Watch Committee. The Court Leet, however, continued to pay the day police illegally from the Poor Rate and the Police Commissioners to raise the Police Rate. This confusion alarmed the Government because Chartism was, at the time, gaining ground and the Home Secretary, Russell, put an Act through to provide a police for Manchester (and also Bolton and Birmingham). This force was recruited from the three forces of Manchester; day, night and council and handed over to the council upon the court decision of 1842. When the government representative had arrived back in 1839 he had found:

that both Brown and Blue police gave much attention to certain properties, taking positions for the whole night close to the houses of certain individuals, and I invariably found that the property most carefully, may I say exclusively, watched, was that of Commissioners of Police or Local Authorities, thus forcing one to suspect that the much famed system of self government was in reality *selfish government* ... In addition to this the streets of the wealthy were much better watched and lighted than those inhabited by the poor.
[From the Manchester Guardian July 18th 1839 quoted by Lady Simon; p.330]

Indeed the need by the middle class especially in "years in which turnouts, as strikes were called, rioting by the unemployed ... and political demonstrations" were frequent, was for an efficient police force whose powers extended to the near townships. The old separate day and night forces had been unable to help one another without consent from a committee and this did not "ensure the speedy assistance which was necessary when starving men were rioting." [Lady Simon, 1938, p70)

There was also a feeling among some of the military that they were called upon too often to deal with situations which the police ought to have sorted out. One Colonel "not at all alluding to Manchester in

particular" wrote that this could lead to a belief "however erroneous, that the people are only kept in subjection by sabres and bayonets." (From a letter to Captain Jebb, a government representative sent to make inquiries about Manchester's local government, May 1838 sent by Colonel Vemyss, Privy Council Papers, 1838, in Lady Simon p. 711)

The police force, as perceived by the middle class, was thus a crucial factor in the fight for Incorporation and further, part of government expansion and the movement towards greater centralisation. In 1854, Palmerston unsuccessfully tried to obtain some control over provincial forces in return for grant aid and rights of inspection and the right to approve the appointment of Chief Constable.³

In his *Victorian Origins of the Welfare State* (Newhaven'60), David Roberts describes the jealousy of local government over central government interference, a dislike shared by Tories and many Whigs. Examples include the sheriffs of Norwich refusing to receive municipal corporation commissioners in 1833 as they saw it as a violation of their common law rights; London corporation fighting to keep their force free of the metropolitan police and the resistance, despite cholera, of many local parishes to orders from the Central Board of Health for sanitary measures.

In 1854, in Manchester, when Palmerston made his attempt, opposition was led by the Town Clerk, who saw the defence of local self-government as part of his job and the municipal borough as a representation of this right. Another Bill of 1856 was successful but only after certain alterations in which the grant and the rights of inspection were accepted.

Later developments in the police in Manchester, included the granting of one day off per fortnight (in 1861) and pay rises to attract the 'right' men and eventually one weeks paid holiday per annum. In *Preventive Police* back in 1829, Chadwick had anticipated these developments and had said that the police had to be adequately remunerated to put them on a "respectable footing"

Lady Simon goes on to delineate how the Manchester police changed over the next decades up to 1938:

The changes in the function of the police is one of the most marked features of the last hundred years. One of the most striking signs of change is their shepherding of school children across the street in Manchester. Their participation in the administration of the various Children's Acts brought them in close touch with the activities of the Education Committee and with other branches of social work.

(Lady Simon, 1938, p336)

Further, businessmen enrolled as special constables on a regular basis and this "day to day companionship" brought them into more contact with the public leading to an appreciation of "their qualities". And as years went by, the police were better educated and policewomen included, albeit without the same powers as the men and with a stress on children and cases of indecent assault in their duties. Again, this public relations consciousness was something Chadwick had commented on saying that as the police depended on the public for information and cooperation, that they (the Police) had to be well liked. Lady Simon believed that their image changed from being anti-working class and "allies of the employers" to, by 1938, a more helpful and friendly one and that this was a result of the greater variety of their duties. (This was something Chadwick had also commented on - the police should perform

other duties while on the beat but the main reason he gave for this was that "Labour and expense would thus be economised." (Lady Simon, 1938, p.209)

The creation of more efficient, regular and diffuse (compared to the military, who were called in for special anti-riot duties and concentrated in barracks all over the country), police force could be seen as a sensible and pragmatic response but it is clear that it was generally thought more important than health measures as a form of regular social policy. Battles between the local and central governments did not signify a denial of the necessity of a *police* force the question was who controlled it. Local government had to rely on the central to give them powers such as the power to incorporate boroughs or create local commissioners but they wanted to apply those powers as they saw fit. As it has been shown there were certain times when the central government wished to have control over local affairs to a greater or lesser degree, but there was also a feeling that local matters could have too much influence over central or national business. Sir Charles Wood, Chancellor of the Exchequer in Russell's government, a staunch defender of local government and laissez-faire, expressed fears that central interference could jeopardise national security and wrote in 1850: "This is the black cloud on the horizon, that we are gradually approaching the state of continental countries where the government is responsible for everything, for whatever goes wrong the government is blamed." (To Russell, quoted by Parriss in *Constitutional Bureaucracy* '69 and from here by Fraser p.208.]
1976

E.P. Thompson defines the main opposition to central authority as "a curious blend of parochial defensiveness, Whig theory, and popular resistance." (1979, p.89) Local rights and customs were cherished and defended against State Laws the gentry and common people. (see, e.g.,

Malcolmson, 1973, 128. re., the Stamford bull runs.] At the same time there was resistance from what B.P. Thompson calls the "older moral economy" to the free market economy. We have already seen how the utilitarianism of many of the middle classes encouraged the use of centralised policy and state intervention," ... on the other side of whose (1979, p89) statist banner were inscribed the doctrine of laissez faire." The government had never been as squeamish about negative methods of social policy as they were about such issues as housing, health or education. The former, which were highly charged with the qualities of "supervision and restraint", included the police and the Poor Law. Hearn attributes the Benthamite belief in a limited state intervention to a justification to their rights over property.

This also entailed measures against workers organising themselves to fight for better wages and conditions. The legislators of the early 19th century understood this at a time when the social policy makers of the mid-century, were, as yet, children, so that all in all, the "first half of the nineteenth century, is anything but laissez-faire in its labour relations." [Hobsbawm 1968, p.352]. Thus, matters which were closest to the economy achieved greater government consideration than those which were not seen as directly important to the market.

The necessity of imposing a common morality had been recognised early on by, for example, Patrick Colquhoun; (See Donajgrodski, 1977, p54) and gradually other spheres came to be seen as social order areas. Laissez-faire in the political and social became seen as impracticable. The fear was deep seated and by the mid-century, appeared almost traditional:

'the awakening of the labouring classes, after the first shocks of the French Revolution, made the upper classes tremble', Frances, Lady Shelley noted in her diary; 'Every man felt the necessity for putting his house in order ... ' To be accurate, most men and women felt the necessity for putting the houses of the poor in order.
[Cited in *The Diary of Lady Shelley, 1787-1817* Ed, R, Edgcumbe 1912 ; pp. 8-9 in E.P. Thompson, 1979, p. 60].

Generally, the forays outside *laissez faire* were seen as regulators to uphold the principles of free competition in the economic sector so that once a case for intervention was proven necessary, "with a doleful glance back at the promised land of *laissez faire*, the state was prepared to embark on a journey which eventually led to a centralised administrative state." [Frazer, 1976, p.114]. It is not helpful, however, to see the state as separate from the mode of production. As Mary McIntosh put it:

The idea of contrasting an interventionist with a non-interventionist state - *laissez faire* versus state control - is a mistaken one, since even *laissez faire* capitalism depends, for ... its existence, upon the bourgeois state."
[In Corrigan P, 1980, 'Capitalism, state formation...', pp.xxi - xxii. From Kuhn and Wolpe Eds, 1978 ; *Feminism and Materialism*.]

Some Ideas on the State

A fairly coherent ideology of middle class patronage coupled with ideas of working class tutelage can be seen to run through the debates and writings about the best means of securing a peaceful and prosperous Britain. Notable exceptions are the working class writers such as William Lovett. The state was, for most middle class writers, an interference with

natural laws, especially concerning economics, but as one supporter of Free Trade put it:

I am, I believe, as strongly attached as any member of this House to the principles of free trade rightly understood. Trade, considered merely with reference to the pecuniary interest of the contracting parties, can scarcely be considered too free. But there is a great deal of trade which cannot be considered as trade, and which affects higher pecuniary interests. And to say that Government never ought to regulate such trade is a monstrous proposition, a proposition at which Adam Smith would have stood aghast.
[Macaulay, House of Commons, May 22, 1846. Quoted by Lady Simon p.396]

Or, as another 20th century writer explains:

As a necessary evil, the state or the public realm could not interfere with the economic activity that took place in society. Since the state as an artifice, could be justified only by its utility, it was morally responsible to carry out those projects - such as the creation of an infrastructure - which the private realm could or would not do. Any direct intercedence into the private realm by the state would constitute the subjugation of natural processes to artificial ones.
[Hearn, 1978, p. 88].

In his book *Culture and Society 1780-1950*, (1976), Raymond Williams selects certain 19th century thinkers whose values, he believes, display points of common interest. Most of these had something to say about the character of the state and some, like Matthew Arnold, held professional posts within it - [Education Dept. Inspector.]

For Arnold, the state should be the means to our perfection - an embodiment of all the best qualities of mankind which transcends class differences. Of all the existing classes, he felt that the aristocracy were too conservative and selfish, the middle class too philistine and the working class too brutal or trying too hard to ape the middle class. None of these were fit to run government. In each class, however, there existed a classless minority "persons who are mainly led, not by their

class spirit, but by a general *humane* spirit, by the love of human perfection."(R. Williams 1976 p.130. From Arnold. *Culture and Anarchy*.)

He felt that the state was necessary so that it would become unnecessary and that state education was one way of hastening such a development.

A Liberal believes in liberalism, and liberalism signifies the non-intervention of the state, But such an ideal is still a long way off from us, and the very means to remove it to an indefinite distance would be precisely the state's withdrawing its actions too soon, [In R. Williams, 1976, p.131]

A "society like ours" needed, he continued, a framework and security to enable it to grow. And while the administrators *do* govern we must "support them in repressing anarchy and disorder."

For another intellectual, John Ruskin, the state should work as an organic whole to ensure wealth (usable articles) was evenly distributed. It should consist of a class system with a properly trained aristocracy at its apex, "to keep order among their inferiors, and raise them always to the nearest level with themselves of which those inferiors are capable."(*Time and Tide* paras. 138 & 139 guided by R. Williams, 1976, p. 521).

The rest of society should consist of merchants and manufacturers to produce, and artists and scholars to develop taste. All education should be paid for by the state. "Necessarily inferior" labour would be done by criminals and 'voluntary aristocrats.' As Raymond Williams states, Ruskin confined his activities towards this end to local experiments and his most useful contributions to the values of his society were his writings condemning competition and the use of innovative design for competitions's sake, so that, "every demand you (the manufacturer) have

created by novelty has fostered in the consumer a habit of discontent; ...
"[from pp.129-31 *The Two Paths* 1887 edition. Williams p.152]. For the socialist, William Morris, state action, whilst necessary in the militant stage of socialism, was not of "its essence".[p.660 *Communism reproduced* *Wesley Morris*. In Williams, 1976, p.150].

Through Socialism, he believed it was possible to :

gain higher wages and shorter working hours for working men themselves; industries may be worked by municipalities for the benefit both of producers and consumers, Working people's houses may be improved, and their management taken out of the hands of commercial speculators. In all this I freely admit a great gain, and am glad to see schemes tried which would lead to it, But great as the gain would be, the ultimate good of it ... would, I think, depend on *how* such reforms were done; in what spirit; or rather what else was being done, while these were going on ...
[Morris in Williams, 1976, p.661].

Social reform then, for Morris, had to be carried out within a general socialist philosophy and programme.

Lovett, in his autobiography, says that state action should be kept to a responsible minimum:

We are opposed, therefore, to all concentrations of power beyond that which is absolutely necessary to make and execute the laws; for, independent of its liability to be corrupt, it destroys those local energies, experiments, and improvements so desirable to be fostered for the advancements of knowledge, and prostrates the whole nation before one uniform, and it may be, a power of despotism,
[W. Lovett, 1920 p.143]

These echoes of the aristocratic worries about state action are then seen from a working class standpoint. It was, of course, understandable that the working class should be suspicious of the government, having been the victims of its repressive side. Moreover, organised government could mean a more organised system of repression. Lovett was in favour

of local responsibility for education but a uniform system of education which could and should resist power concentration. While government should provide education through taxation and build schools "We are decidedly opposed to the placing of such immense power and influence in the hands of the Government as that of the selecting the teachers and superintendents, the books and kinds of instruction, and the whole management of schools in each locality." The uniformity of the education system should be decided and placed in the hands of the people and not government.

Education.

The whole question of educational provision for the working class invoked passionate debate throughout the 19th century and is as deeply embedded in class relations as the issue of the Poor Law. (It is of special concern as 19th century thoughts on education were brought to bear on policies governing museums.) As has been said, "Policies were of different kinds, depending on the problem. But we must stress, once more, the emphasis laid on transforming working class behaviour." [R. Johnson, Donajgrodzki, 1977, p.89].

The potter Charles Shaw, recollected that he heard "a clergyman oppose educating the people on the grounds that they would write nasty things on the walls." (1983, p45)

In a chapter entitled 'Education, Art Galleries, Libraries,' Lady Simon [1938, p.212], describes how ,at the beginning of the 19th century, the question was not so much *how* the working class should be educated,

but *if*. The doubts consisted of fears of educating them, on the one hand, and on the other hand, fears of not educating them. One newspaper in 1825 spoke of a fear of Mechanics Institutes and described this attempt at 'popular education' as

A scheme more completely adapted for the destruction of this empire could not have been invented by the author of evil himself than that which the vanity of others, and the supineness of a third and more important class, has so nearly perfected.
[Hammonds 1945; p.109, From *St. James Chronicle*,]

In 1844, Engels wrote how the bourgeoisie had "little to hope, and much to fear, from the education of the working class" [1969 p.141] deploring the fact that, from a budget of fifty five millions, it gave only £40,000 to Education. Other views expressed that apart from risking popular unrest, education would "be prejudicial to their morals and happiness" and if made to despise their lot in life they would become "fractious" and insubordinate. It would "enable them to read seditious pamphlets, vicious books, and publications against Christianity" and the upshot would be "more vigorous laws." [Hansard, (H) ix 798 nn. In Hammonds 1978 p.381.

However, as Sir Benjamin Heywood, President of the Manchester Mechanic's Institute, said in 1827, "I am at a loss to see how we are disturbing the proper station of the working classes, and giving them undue elevation; we do not alter their relative position ... " [Hammonds, 1945 pp.109-10]. (Working class education continued to be feared for some time however. An historian writing in 1835 and commenting on trade union activity among women card setters in the West Riding, went as far as to say: "Alarmists may view these indications of female independence as more menacing to the established institutions than the education of the lower

orders." [From John Wade's *History of the Middle and Working Classes* - in E.P. Thompson 1979 p.4541.)

Although education as a right was still a minority view (held by such writers as James Mill, Radicals like Roebuck - the middle class man who wanted to make the working classes 'like me' - and working class activists such as Lovett) the fears of insurrection following the French Revolution had to some extent been allayed and there was a growing feeling that if the '3 R's' were mixed with religious teaching and religious teachers, education could be "a safeguard rather than a solvent of society." [Lady Simon 1938, 214-215]. Furthermore, "The existence of perhaps a quarter or a third of the working classes who were totally illiterate, and a further percentage whose literacy was only rudimentary, constituted a barrier to the spread of middle class ideology." [J.F.C. Harrison, 1961, p.42] And perhaps knowledge, and through it, understanding, would make the working class endure their situation. If they could be made to see the undeniable truth in political economy they would cease to question it. In the 1830's it was becoming a case of, "Scratch a Benthamite or a political economist and quickly discover an educationalist. From Malthus' Second Essay on Population onwards, economists heavily endorsed educational solutions." [R. Johnson in Donajkowski, 1977, p.83]

Certain subjects were thought to be "sensitive". In a broadsheet called *A suggestion for the formation of a class for the study of Political Economy in the Halifax Mechanic's Institute* (1833) a case is made against the ban on the teaching of politics and theology because they were considered dangerous topics especially for an institution which

gathered together large numbers of working class people. [Hammonds, 1945, p.109.]

Lovett himself (1920, p.101, in an address to the Working Classes of Belgium 1836) states his faith in the power of education for the promotion of knowledge. The power generated by knowledge comes from the freeing of man from illusions and hypocrisies which bind the working class. Knowledge is "the most efficient means of happiness"[p. 139] and thus education free of religious bigotry is a tool in the class-war. Without education men succumb to "seductive vices" and this want of moral training through education leads to a low, vicious existence. The working classes must be willing to help themselves and this was one of the justifications Brougham used in setting up the mechanics' institutes.

The theme of 'Knowledge is Power' was important to the working class movement. It was the motto at the heading of Hetherington's *Poor Man's Guardian* [E.P. Thompson, 1979, p.800] (In fact, newspapers were not allowed in mechanics' institutes.) E.P. Thompson quotes from a letter written by a miner and left in the house of a colliery viewer in 1831 during a strike and it expresses this idea that knowledge contains the seeds of power and the fear of it by the middle class:

I was at yor hoose last neet, and meyd mysel very comfortable. Ye hey nee family, and yor just won man on the colliery, and I see ye hev a greet lot of rooms, and big cellars, and plenty wine and beer in them, which I got ma share on. Noo I naw some at wor colliery that has three of fower lads and lesses, and they live in one room not half as gude as yor cellar, I don't pretend to naw very much, but I naw there shun't be that much difference. The only place we can get to o the week ends is the yel hoose and hev a pint. I dinna pretend to be a profit, but I naw this, and lots o ma marrows na's te, that were not tret as we owt to be, and a great filosofher says, to get noledge is to naw wer ignerent. But weve just begun to find that oot, and ye maisters and owners may luk oot, for yor not gan to get se much o yor own way, wer gan to hev some o wors now... [R. Fynes, *The Miners of Northumberland and Durham* 1923 edn., 21, E.P. Thompson, 1979, p.785]

Thomas Carlyle also made the connection between education and knowledge and freedom from oppression. This freedom is however one which is more than freedom from the oppression of man by man but is expressed as a "heavenly freedom" in his institutions and "loftiest attainments". He said:

Knowledge, education are opening the eyes of the humblest; are increasing the number of thinking minds without limit. This is as it should be, for not in turning back, not in resisting, but only in resolutely struggling forward does our life consist... Political freedom is hitherto the object of these efforts; but they will not and cannot stop there. It is towards a higher freedom than mere freedom from oppression by his fellow-mortal, that man dimly aims. Of this higher, heavenly freedom... all his noble institutions... are but the body, and more and more approximate emblems. [Works of Thomas Carlyle; VOL II p. 233 in R. Williams, pp.88-89]

Educational reformers saw the coincidence of the Chartist movement and the call for state education and that "Working people were not merely ignorant but increasingly had their own kinds of knowledge" (R. Johnson in Donajgradzki, 1977, p.91) Intervention by government was seen as necessary by such people and a summary of why is expressed here by Thomas Wyse, "Give what otherwise will be taken. By giving you acquire the means and rights of purifying, regulating, and directing; you become master of the new power, instead of the new power becoming yours." (*Educational Reform: Or the Necessity of a National System of Education*. London 1836, quoted by R. Johnson in Donajgradzki, p.91) To this end Wyse advocated state education (and museums) with the government supplying "the great element of all state organisations - a central, controlling and directing power." (Donajgradzki, 1977p92) From Education in the U.K.] As Richard Johnson points out, the political economists of the 1830's had "few of Adam Smith's original doubts" about

state interference in education and educationalists "explicitly attacked the application of laissez-faire to schooling". The interest in their position, he believes, lies less in its relationship to correct economic principles and more in the *attitudes it shows towards the working class*. This is true today for historians and sociologists and is the reason why I am detailing views of writers contemporary and present day on such issues as education, the state and culture.

The efforts of most educationalists at this time centred on educational provision for children. Parallel moves were, however, being made for a middle class organised adult education with the emphasis on education as a civilising force and also education as a part of this process. As the Hammonds say, "For the first time there existed a vast proletariat, with no property but its labour, and therefore in the eyes of its rulers bound by no ties to the society in which it lived except by the ties that discipline could create." [1978, p.39] The nature of the contractual relationship means that some manufacturers were not seen as "people with faculties and characters to be encouraged and developed". As one large employer said of his workers - "I don't want one of your intellectuals; I want a man that will work and take his glass of ale: I'll think for him." [in Hammonds, 1978, p.39, from *First Report of the Factory Commission 1833*, E. p. 18]

By 1825 Brougham's ideas had been bearing fruit; a mechanics' institute was established in York and eight in the West Riding. Local variations occurred but there was a general reliance on middle class support. In Leeds, decisions were made by vote at meetings but were only given to those members who paid two pounds entrance deposit and a ten shillings a year fee as opposed to the five shillings per half-year which

was favoured by the working class students. [see also *The Potteries In the Year of the Great Exhibition*, a WEA survey p23-25, 1951]

The mechanic's institute of Leeds emphasised that its primary aim was "to instruct Workmen engaged in every branch of mechanical labour, in those principles of science on which their respective arts depend." [J.F.C. Harrison, 1961, p.62] and to "improve the skill and practice of those classes of men, who are essentially conducive to the prosperity of this large manufacturing town."

Labourers were to add to Scientific Knowledge and Progress and it was expected that working class men would patent inventions.

Who can tell but that some happy thought, suggesting itself to the mind of an hitherto obscure member of a Mechanic's Institute, may pave the way to results, far surpassing in splendour and usefulness those which the genius of a Watt, a Boulton, or an Arkwright has achieved, stupendous and magnificent as they confessedly are? [Account of the Proceedings connected with the Inauguration of the Rev. J. Acworth A.M. as President of the Bradford Mech.'s Institute, September 16th 1837, p.20 - Quoted by J.F.C. Harrison, p.64].

Mechanics' Institutes were criticised for being "pitched far too high" (*Quarterly Review* 1863 in *ibid* p.65) and there were numerous problems that their keen supporters had failed to take into account. These included such things as poor housing conditions of the working class, the lack of spectacles and candles and tiredness. Chadwick, in his Sanitary Report, had linked physical conditions and moral welfare and stated that the "effects of education are more transient than with a healthy population." [Ed. Harvie, Martin and Scharf, 1970, p.139]. What, in fact, the founders of Mechanics' Institutes found was that there was often a reluctance by working class men to join them and those that did, tended to give up in times of economic hardship.

A lecturer to mechanics' institutes described in 1849 what a pupil would be presented with at a typical lecture:

Let us imagine a workman eager to know the secrets of the new balloons, attending Mr. Tatum's first lecture on *Aerostation* at the London Mechanics' Institution. This is what he would be told at the outset, "Before the principles of *Aerostation* could be properly comprehended, a knowledge of *Pneumatics* was requisite; and he had the right to presume, from the lectures which had been delivered on that subject, that the Members were acquainted with the nature and properties of *air*. A knowledge of *hydrostatics* is also essential to the study of a science which treats of bodies floating in a certain medium, by displacing a quantity of the fluid in which they float, equal in weight to the floating body. Besides this, it is necessary to know that *air* is a *gravitating medium*, and, therefore, not only *pneumatics*, but *Hydrostatics* must be understood; so far, at least, as relates to the *specific gravities* of bodies. Chemistry is also necessary ...

[Hammonds, 1945, pp.111-21]

By the forties, 'popular' lectures (on literary and fashionable topics) were more numerous than scientific topics. Science was not abandoned entirely but there was a shift of emphasis. Many institutes turned into general interest societies with lectures on anything from astronomy and phrenology to literature with lantern shows. More and more lower middle class people were joining and working class less and less.⁴ One contemporary writer did not regret this fact and refused to accept the "pitched too high" viewpoint, considering it an implication of working class inferiority, said instead that

The full capacity of the people has never yet been tried. Prior to the present generation, works on Education always meant the education of the gentleman ... We are now learning to think that all may get at least some education ... Until the mind of the people had been properly trained, it is absurd to deduce from their apathy a natural antagonism to their intellectual culture."
[J.F.C. Harrison p. 130, From James Hole *Essay on Mechanics' Institutes*,]

In 1848 James Hole supplied the idea of holding evening reading and writing classes in Leeds Mechanics' Institute. He saw elementary teaching as the prerequisite to a form of people's college which would not use light entertainment as an attraction. Hole was interested in the quality of study and believed that classes were more useful than lectures or library reading. The last was cited as a success story in the institutes but although the numbers of books sounded impressive the typical Mechanics' Institute library book was described (by Samuel Smiles) as "dull and heavy". One lecturer said, "Many of the books are gift books, turned out of people's shelves, and are never used ... so that, out of 1,000 volumes, perhaps there may be 400 or 500 useful ones." (Hammonds 1945 p.112-13). (Although there was a ban on political books this in practice meant controversial political works, for example, on suffrage, for there were often books on orthodox political economy including writing by people such as Malthus. (Harrison, 1961, p83)

Funds were always needed and various fund-raising activities included concerts, panoramas and the ever popular temporary exhibition. (Mechanics' Institutes often had their own mini-museum, "though the museums of stuffed natural-history specimens or models of machinery usually became neglected dust traps, instead of producing the intellectual elevation expected from them.") (Hammonds 1954 p. 115). Thus, the working class never conformed to the idea that they were "scattered rays of genius" to be gathered together for the sake of Progress.

As early as 1808, Cobbett had criticised 'popular education' and saw it in the same light as charity schemes which were a "comforting system" which could be nothing other than "interference on the one side, and

dependence on the other." (Williams, 1976, p34. From the *Political Register* July 16th).

Other famous working class men had advocated self-education - Lovett and Samuel Bamford - and their efforts "lived long in popular memory, perpetuated in rough framed prints on cottage walls, in oral traditions of Reform and Chartist meetings, and in their autobiographies." (Harrison, 1961, p44)

These efforts furnished examples for middle class interpretations of Smilesian self help and also were examples to working class people. The overall picture is of a dogged determination to learn despite heavy odds against. That one could advance socially through one's own exertions was admired as a sort of rugged individualism and conversely as a starting point of working class self-education based on mutual improvement. Harrison describes the mutual improvement movement as a "spontaneous working-class response to felt needs." (Harrison, 1961, p54)

As a collective effort to accomplish what was very difficult alone, its "pedigree" was "Owenite rather than laissez-faire liberal."

Mutual improvement groups generally meant a small number who met in each other's houses or a small hired room. A rudimentary programme might be drawn up and a small stock of books bought. It was voluntary and although the '3 R's' were a big feature, there was sometimes geography, history, French and chemistry. Often they extended into discussion and debating groups and here topics could be aired which were banned at the Mechanics' Institute. These groups mushroomed in the 1840's and were used by Radical politicians to publish their aims. In the Chartist movement there were education sessions and these groups organised discussions, readings of periodicals and lent books. The Leeds Radical Universal

Suffrage Association, the Leeds Chartist Organisation, stated that political education was part and parcel of the desire for universal suffrage.

In Halifax in 1842 a school was opened two nights a week for adults to teach everything from the alphabet upwards in a bid to dispel ignorance and in Bradford they even opened a Sunday school.

Coffee houses and reading rooms were also set up to mix education with temperance. Clubs and reading groups were not a new phenomenon as they had been held in taverns in the late 18th century. but they were formed mostly by anti-religious dissenters which, due to restrictive legislation, led a fugitive existence. E.P. Thompson describes one of the London Corresponding Societies which held discussions and took subscriptions, as a "premature Workers Education Association." Among others, there was one formed in Sheffield which started with a group of five or six mechanics and which grew to over 2,000 in four months and involved such readings as Thomas Paine's *The Rights of Man*. As national organisations were illegal they maintained a national framework through corresponding - hence the name.[Thompson 1979 p.169]

In the 1830's, a permanent reading room was set up in Hanley which was open from 8am to 10pm, which had readings from the evening papers every day and penalties for swearing or drunkenness. And in 1833, John Doughty had a Coffee and Newsroom attached to his Manchester bookshop which took over ninety newspapers a week. . The readings were of obvious benefit to the illiterate. (Thompson makes the point that illiteracy among the working class is overestimated and that readership figures are not reflected in the numbers of newspapers that were taken as they are read over and over again by different people , 1979, p787-8).

Reading rooms were also organised by the Church. The Rev. Dr. Hook, who had ideas of Anglican Mechanics' Institutes *before* he arrived in Leeds in 1837, first set up Church of England libraries and reading rooms which aimed to "counteract the Socialists." (From W.R.W. Stephens, *The Life and Letters of Walter Farquar Hook* one Vol.edn. 1885 p.287. Quoted in Harrison, 1961,p182)

In 1837, a Leeds Church Institute was established and one of its aims was the study of theology while in Bradford it could be said that religious influences had already begun for the Mechanics' Institute of 1832 was started with mainly middle class Baptists and Quakers.

By 1860 the involvement of religion in education was thoroughly established. Adult schools were started by the Society of Friends in York (1857) and although fairly successful in educational terms, very few members of the working classes became members of the Society itself. Throughout the countryside of Yorkshire, there were also 'formal and spontaneous' attempts in education. These were mainly literacy classes and were often run by the daughters of clergymen in their own homes. Farm labourers, if they were allowed by the farmer, attended, but these efforts were spasmodic as labouring jobs tended to be transitory. Some examples were mainly middle class built around lectures on popular or specialised subjects. One clergyman said of his class, "My success is owing, under God, to my being captain of the Cricket club ... " (Harrison 1961, p193)

In the Sunday School movement, which began in Manchester in the late 18th. century, there was the feeling that it was counteracting education which exposed people to seditious literature. In literacy classes children and adults could be taught to read using the bible and

in order to read the bible [Shaw, 1983, p. 192]. Some had lending libraries. When the Manchester Statistical Society carried out its survey of education in 1834 for Manchester it was discovered that of the number of children who went to some form of school that half as many more went to Sunday School. Moreover Sunday Schools could "furnish opportunities of instruction... without interfering with any weekday industry." (Lady Simon, p. 213, quoted from *History of English Elementary Education* by F. Smith p. 49) and ensure that leisure hours were spent in some form of moral improvement.⁵

One of the reasons Frazer gives for the growth of the Victorian administrative state is government intervention in spheres such as health and education which he describes as examples of state supervised philanthropy - a combination of voluntary and state action which created a "self-generating administrative momentum". Why and how did the government involve itself in education? The answer to why has already been answered to some extent in terms of social control and political beliefs; there are, however, other reasons which lie within this general boundary but which are specifically related to administration and which I will touch upon in the description of the Education Department later.

Another reason, given by many writers [e.g., Frazer, Sleeman, Musgrave and Lady Simon] relates to the economy. It is that advancing Industrialism needed a better educated manpower. Musgrave says that the reason state provided education came late in the 19th century was that it was only later on that the smooth running of the economy depended on the educational system for a supply of educated people both at managerial and operative levels. This was backed up by foreign competition,

Further international exhibitions followed the Great Exhibition of 1851. In 1867 there was an exhibition in Paris at which the rate of industrial progress of Germany in particular, but also of other industrializing countries, was very clear for all to see. Various official reports had made it clear that the rapid progress of German industry was based on a well organised system of state elementary schools. Observers also commented on the extremely well-disciplined nature of the German labour force, and this was at least partly attributed to the sound system of basic schooling. [Musgrave, 1976, pp.28-9]

Lady Simon quotes the Manchester Statistical Society which, in its Report on Education in Liverpool in 1835, was advocating, on these grounds, a State system of education. They point to the inadequacies of Britain compared with abroad and state;

It has been the common boast in England, that in her public undertakings the cooperation of private individuals has effected greater wonders, than all the wealth and power of governments in foreign countries... Private benevolence has effected something, but its efforts shrink into hopeless insignificance when compared with... the German States. [Lady Simon, p.223]

The first moves of government in education were in the 1802 Health and Morals of Apprentices Act by which factory owners had to provide instruction in the 3 R's between 6am. and 9pm. in the first four years of the seven of the apprenticeship. State responsibility stopped short of funding and could not regulate it because "the machinery of government was minimal". (Musgrave '76, p6) Most elementary education for the working class was a "charitable undertaking by the Churches", and in 1833 they received a grant aid from the government of £20,000 which rose to £30,000 in 1838. Most elementary schools were provided by the National Society (C of E) and the Foreign Schools Society (Non-Conf.) and, in 1839, a Committee of the Privy Council was set up to supervise them. The reason for this was "complexities of administration" and it was "the

first governmental body responsible for any form of education in modern England." (Musgrave, 1976, p.21) It consisted of a small staff with Kay-Shuttleworth as its secretary.

By this time the "... Churches were then so firmly entrenched in the eyes of the public as the right instruments of education that the grant only got through parliament on the understanding that it was to be distributed by the two religious bodies." (Lady Simon 1938p253) Divisions between rich and poor were embodied not only in the different schools but also in the curriculum. None of the classics for the working classes - the main emphasis in their education was the '3 R's'. Lady Simon believes that this is inevitable in a society which used education as an insurance against unrest; thus only a minimum was necessary: "religion, of course, to teach him (the poor child) his place in a divinely ordered world, writing and arithmetic so that he could be a useful worker, and reading so that he could not only read the Bible but also the works of Adam Smith and learn to understand the 'Laws of Political Economy.'" (Lady Simon 1938, p253)

By 1850, less than half of the children in England and Wales received an education and a high proportion of those that did were taught by people who, in reality, were no more than child minders. In 1861, the Newcastle Commission reported on the state of education in England and came up with the idea of 'payment by results'. (Grants were linked to the numbers of successful examination candidates and introduced in 1862 as the Revised Code) to encourage teachers to pay more attention to less able pupils and because "the commissioners held the common view of the period that the notion of accountability, so vital to a well-run business, should be applied vigorously to all forms of government expenditure." (Musgrave, 1976, p.35). They defined elementary education as "the ability

to read 'a common narrative', writing 'a letter that shall be both legible and intelligible' and knowing 'enough of ciphering to make out, or test the correctness of a common shop bill' ... "[Musgrave, 1976, p.36].

In 1870, School Boards were created (for an account of a board see Lady Simon p.240 ff) and they did not have to rely totally on government as they had rate aid. W.E. Forster defined his bill in terms of its financial and administrative rationale as it was "to complete the present voluntary system, to fill up the gaps, sparing the public money where it can be done without ... "[Musgrave, 1976, p.37]. In 1880, elementary education in England and Wales became compulsory (from 1870 local boards could make their own bye laws about this). Lady Simon describes how this effected the population of Manchester where working class women who had previously gone out to work felt obliged, when their daughters could no longer stay at home, to give up their jobs, at a time when incomes were lost through sons attending school. "The battle for the child between industry and the school never raged so fiercely as during the forty-eight years between 1870 and the Fisher Act of 1918 ... Until compulsion began, Industry, with the exception of the Factory Acts, had had all its own way, but after 1870 the school began slowly to pull the child back from the factory ... "[Lady Simon, 1938, p254)

Fee paying was abolished in 1891 and in 1899 the minimum leaving age was 12 (it could be made to be 14 by local bye-law) and in 1902, Secondary Schools were publicly provided. This solved a problem that the school boards had found, namely that it was difficult to keep pupils at the '3 R's' level when they were capable of more , but were too young to leave and could go no further.

This was a late development which had not in the past been deemed appropriate for working class children - as Harrison says "secondary education was practically synonymous with middle-class education."

This sketch of 19th Century developments in education attests to its growth as a form of 'state supervised philanthropy' but with government becoming more and more involved in and responsible for decisions and finance. These were mostly arranged and influenced by the government department which had started as a Committee of the Privy Council in 1839.

The Education Department

The composition of the Education Department from 1839 onwards and its personnel, reiterate the various class positions on social policy and describe the changing role of the administration in its relation to government. Richard Johnson in *Administrators in Education Before 1870: Patronage, Social position and Role* [in G. Sutherland Ed. 1977] describes the *education* department, but believes that it may be useful in "suggesting hypotheses" about the civil service as a whole. It would be surprising if there were not deep differences between different departments, especially departments formed in the 1830's in the response to industrial problems and others with a much longer history and tradition such as the Treasury or the Foreign Office. He supposes that the development of an educational civil service would have more in common with the Poor Law Commission and Board in its evolution. And Johnson says that he does not want to avoid idiosyncracies such as "the curiously

inexpert character of the English bureaucracy" but his aim is to create a general study of recruitment, social position and patronage which will eventually provide the tools for an explanation of why the civil service developed as it did.

The department had only three inspectors at first and yet even ten years later, each had 240 schools to inspect and other departments were even worse off, for example, mines, where *the* inspector had 2,000 mines to regulate. Even when the education department was given more staff, it did not keep pace with the growing numbers of schools. An Inspector's duties included testing pupil teachers, certifying schoolmasters, checking finances, examining classrooms and writing lengthy reports. "Such were the Herculean labours an ... economically minded Parliament expected of its civil servants." (Roberts 1968 p.120). Decisions were taken by departments which could not realistically be carried out and had to provide the wherewithal to meet them as time went by. There was often great diversity of organisation between departments, some were close knit and liaised with each other, whilst within others, staff tended to go their own ways and hardly ever met.

By 1849 the Education Department had fifty employees including the assistant secretary, inspectors and clerks, not to mention the Lord President and his colleagues on the Committee of Council for Education, the department's legislative superstructure. Additions to the staff followed the growth in planning with very little planning itself and the administration was "very personal, very unbureaucratic." Specialists - architects and inspectors - were recruited through the patronage of the Lord President and usually on the recommendation of Kay-Shuttleworth who was the main administrator. He was thought of as being "obsessed

with growth" and on the basis laid down by him, great expansion did occur. Increases in Grants meant staff increases, especially as they were paid directly to each school.

Johnson (in G. Sutherland) discusses how so-called 'experts' with their emphasis on efficiency and method saw the state as the way to reform and they saw their problem as a question of how "to install, at the centre of state power, the kind of directing force which their whole programme required." (1972 . Moreover, although it may appear that the experts did not form ^{p95)} any recognisable group, they formed a circle of influence and:

As the biographies suggest, there were also certain nodal points where the experts met and discussed their enthusiasms; the London salons, the Statistical Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, the provincial networks of organisations like the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, Caucuses around particular government enquiries or departments, especially the Poor Law Commission, and the friendships and contacts tying Edinburgh to London. Experts did not form a group in the classic sociological sense, nor even, united by a single organisation, a 'movement'. But personal links were quite dense and expertise did have a definite social character and a real ideological coherence. At its heart was a coalition of liberal intellectuals with strong personal or ideological links with industrial capital. (Sutherland, 1972, p.87. Later, we shall see if this applies to art intellectuals and museums]

In his essay on the Education department, Johnson recognises three different tiers of social and political sequences typical of the civil service as a whole and representative of different generations with different methods of recruitment, social position and role. Charles Greville, for example, who was Clerk to the Privy Council, owed much to his birth into a 'cadet branch of the aristocracy' and he belonged to a pre-industrial era of government; to the system (pre - 1839) of patronage with its family links and social dependency. After 1839,

patronage was characterised much more by an emphasis on the appropriate expertise and the civil servant as mediator between patron and client. Dr. Kay (later calling himself Kay-Shuttleworth) was such an example. He had been active as a middle class radical in Manchester where he wrote *The Moral and Physical Conduct of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester*, 1832, and organised the Manchester Statistical Society to investigate urban educational provision. He was an ardent supporter of the New Poor Law and even devised a scheme for pauper emigration. He was friends with the Whig, Lord Russell, whose government were considering action in education in 1837. While Secretary to the Committee on Education, he influenced the Lord President to recruit men similar to himself - social investigators, educationalists and other 'public servants' including former Poor Law Commissioners. It seemed natural that:

Once in a position of authority, a Benthamite ... tended to recruit junior staff of his own way of thinking. It is no accident that Kay and E.C. Tufnell, Arnott and Southwood-Smith, should have been appointed to, or used for inquiries in, the the Poor Law Office. It is no accident that in his turn, Kay should appoint inspectors of the character of Tremeneheere, or Joseph Fletcher.
[S.E. Finer - *The Transmission of Benthamite Ideas 1820-50* p.29, In Sutherland Ed., 1972]

Not all experts were Benthamites, but of those who were not 'first degree' Benthamites, or Benthamites at all, a large number came into contact with those who were and many were influenced. S.E. Finer makes the point that the circle of intellectual elite was narrower then than now, and therefore personal contact through salons, cliques, clubs and societies "could powerfully affect the whole body of informed opinion."(Sutherland, 1972, p14)⁶

People like Edwin Chadwick and James Mill along with many others, contributed to newspapers and belonged to clubs such as the Political Economy Club and the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. They believed in the power of the written word and were against the tax on newspapers or 'tax on knowledge.' Members of the P.E.C. were pledged to counter any articles in the Press which were "hostile to the sound views on Political Economy" by publishing the "seasonable truths." [Taken from A. Bain, *James Mill*, London 1882 pp.198-200, Sutherland, 1972, p16)

Of the sixty-three surviving members from between 1821 and 1841, fourteen were 'first degree' Benthamites, seven had held ministerial position, eight were M.P.'s and twenty civil servants." The result was to introduce Benthamite precepts and examples to a wide circle of influential people: aristocrats who had ministerial patronage, merchants and bankers who were often M.P.'s and a swarm of humbler persons who were later deployed to fill vacancies in an expanding civil service." [S.E. Finer. In Sutherland, 1972, p.19].

The whole process of the transmission of these ideas consisted, according to Finer, of three stages: *irradiation* or the exposure to Benthamite thought; *suscitation* - the arranging of public inquiries to influence opinion within powerful groups such as M.P.'s and thirdly *permeation* where Benthamites gained official employment and used to obtain further posts for others of similar persuasions. He gives a convincing picture of the second stage whereby Benthamites manipulated Select Committees and Royal Commissions. People like Joseph Hume or Chadwick could get a friendly M.P. to move a Select Committee for which he could choose the majority of members and once this sympathetic group assembled another tactic was the careful selection of witnesses. Civil

servants who often had strong views on issues such as free trade could and did sit on committees on such matters and get their evidence printed and circulated all over the country.

Permeation, as defined by Finer, has been mentioned already. In the '30's this applied more to the newer offices such as Education, Poor Law Commission, Factory Inspectorate and the Board of Trade.

So far the older patronage and social position and the more recent patronage and social position based on expertise have been mentioned; there was a third type established by 1848 described by Johnson as the younger influx. Generally, these men had a common educational background, Balliol, and had cultural affinities with the aristocracy. They were a clique who showed little interest in education or work - "exactly the same sort of society that is to be found in any College Common Room" and "they were scholars, poets, philosophers and musicians etc., and were ready to discuss - and discuss well - any subject under the sun except education." (Johnson: Sutherland 1972, p128 taken from Sir G.W. Kekewich - *The Education Department and After* 1920 p.81. These younger men admired Kay's skill, but considered him uneducated. Johnson, asks how the social position of the civil servant may influence his role within government. Where public office is connected to the political aristocracy by older forms of patronage, there will be no real distinction between civil servant and politician, in fact, here "the term 'Civil Servant' itself, with its connotations of professionalism, will be inappropriate." And the role will be one of "the honourable performance of prescribed duties" rather than dynamic or innovatory. The expert such as Dr. Kay, however, seeks to create policy and work on lawmaking opinion - "He was a fount of policy, chief executant of it,

secret negotiator in chief, public apologist, stimulator of public pressure, former of public opinion." (See also Parriss 1969 Chp. III, Sutherland, 1972, p133).

Johnson believes that the work of the Kays and the Chadwicks led to a higher qualitative as well as quantitative growth in administration. And although

It is true that once launched the Department showed certain built-in tendencies to grow, though dynamism in this case was based on the grant system not on the progressive enforcement of legislation, Local agents needed money; the Department was prepared to provide it on certain conditons. Qualitative growth was also, in a sense, the result of a process; the establishment of a dynamic *rappor*t between an inspectorate eager to influence policy and a secretary who directed their inquiries, used their reports to influence opinion and made coherent recommendations to politicians. (Sutherland, 1972, p.13217

In 1850, R.R.W. Lingen succeeded Kay-Shuttleworth and although he inherited the policy-making discretions of the latter there was a sharp contrast in the two administrations. Kay-Shuttleworth is generally characterised as being from the 'heroic generation' (a term used by Kitson-Clark and here borrowed by Johnson who made education "one of the finest of the central departments." [Roberts, 1968, p.131]. Lingen, however, is seen as lacking the vision of Kay-Shuttleworth shown in such examples as the 1846 Minutes in which he advocated teacher training and money was made available for this end. Lady Simon describes this as the foundation of professionalism in teaching and Johnson as an example of his concern with the quality of education. Lingen led a systematic deparature from this so that "After 1850 qualitative growth was replaced by control, latterly by reaction and retrenchment. Quantitative growth continued: more schools reached, much more money spent, many emendations

of and accretions to the Minutes." [Referring to the 1846 Minutes, Johnson, in G. Sutherland 1972, p.134] That the Department became 'instrumental' rather than 'suggestive' can be explained in Lingen's view of government; he thought that local government should provide their own services and that the central government's role was merely one of support.

It was Lingen who coined the phrase "passionless bureaucracy"

(from a Memorandum of 1855 written by Lingen). The move towards greater professionalism and away from the traditional reciprocal ties was a transition in which "...the social meaning attached to personal influence underwent a change. Impersonality equated with impartiality, became a virtue: 'influence', the distinction between its legitimate and illegitimate forms forgotten, came to be regarded as a sort of corruption." (Donajgrodzki, 1977, p.23, Intro. by Donajgrodzki) Allied to this view of the civil servant which still exists today is the hope and desire for a non-political civil servant. (Carswell says, "On the whole the civil servant does not make choices: he presents them in analytical form. He does not make precedents: he applies them." Today a civil servant is excluded from formally supporting a political party. J. Carswell, 1966, p.8).

In the 1840's the Poor Law Board was in theory free from party politics but, as we have seen, it could be open to all sorts of political pressures. In 1846 Parliament insisted that the president of the Board had to be an MP. There was a feeling that the same appointees should survive changes in governments and in 1853 the Leeds Mercury expressed alarm at "a system which changes the government Board of Education with every change of administration." [Roberts, 1968, p34)

There was a belief that professionals would be non-political. Non-political, however, is often mistaken for non-active and Lingen's approach can be seen as political but of a different kind or slower than his predecessors. The 'administrative ethic' was by the 50's already present in the Treasury and, as Johnson says [Sutherland, 1972, p.137] the professional ethic narrowed the definition of a civil service. (Lingen was Permanent Secretary to the Treasury 1870-1885.)

The British Museum and the Civil Service.

The report of Northcote and Trevelyan, "The Organisation of the Permanent Civil Service" [23.11.53], called for an "efficient body of permanent officers." (Campbell, 1965., p.25). These were to be subordinate to Ministers, the Crown and Parliament, but have "sufficient independence, character, ability and experience to be able to advise, assist, and to some extent, influence those who are, from time to time, set over them." The report recommended entry by examination, a system of rewards and greater unity within the service. A central board was called for to supervise exams and thereby stop patronage. A doctor's certificate would also be desirable from those applying for posts, as too many "sickly youths" had burdened the service. The report was accompanied by a letter from Jowett of Balliol in which he described the type of exam desirable. Moral character would, he said, be tested for, the self discipline necessary to acquire the knowledge to pass the exam would be "a great security that a young man had not led a dissolute life." He believed that although some may laugh at the idea of exams for the

lower jobs, that a test would have a good influence on the education of the "lower classes." The motive would be that of "bettering himself in life."

The report was circulated to numerous religious leaders, teachers and politicians. Thirty-eight replied (including Dr. Lyon Playfair) and most support came from educationalists. Some complaints about the notion of examinations stemmed from the fear that working class people would win and Ministers would, says Parriss, "find it repugnant if not quite impossible, to work ... "[69,p3IThe Civil Service Commission, set up in 1855 (with three Commissioners) had the responsibility of ensuring the junior posts were filled by men of "calibre." There was a loophole, however, for men who took posts where there was no age limit for superior posts who may have "special qualifications." [from *The Order in Council of the Commission.*] The Commission reported later that during 1855-1859^e, only about one fifth of all nominations competed by examination and more than one half of these failed. Parriss describes how there were attacks on the Commission. One, by Anthony Trollope (then surveyor in the Post Office) as witness to the Commission. He criticised the impracticality of the new stringency. He got a man for sorting work for a certain postmaster but he was rejected because he could not spell. Trollope was outraged because he said that the man would never have been called upon to spell but was a fast sorter. The difficulty was that men would not trouble to take an exam for such a low post, but he "recommended a considerable increase of salary, and that increase was obliged to be given; so that a higher rate of payment was incurred and a man much less fit for that work was appointed." (Parriss, 1969, p36-7)

A similar complaint was made in 1864 by Panizzi, Principle Librarian at the British Museum. He was sent a letter (17.10.64), from the Commissioners to remind the trustees of qualifications "required of persons who may be appointed Assistants ... " (Parliamentary Papers 1866 - XXXIX p.245, Communications between the Commissioners...). They stipulated good written work and dictation; two languages (besides English, and one to be Greek or Latin); knowledge of the first four rules of Arithmetic; the literary and political history of England and also of Rome and Greece. There was a problem because the Museum had sacked an assistant in the Department of Manuscripts because of his lack of prowess in French and Latin. Panizzi thought the situation ludicrous, for he now had a vacancy in one department when another candidate had also been rejected in another, although he was "a very meritorious candidate." The point was that Mr. Gemmer, who had been dismissed, *had* the certificate and Mr. Butler, whom Panizzi favoured, did not. Panizzi complained that Butler had been nominated to be assistant in the Zoology Department and had worked very well in the Department before, as a minor assistant, but that the examination tested him on questions quite unrelated to Natural History. He was asked questions like: "How many sonnets had Milton left us?" (P.P., 1866, p251)

Campbell points out that it was a long time before there was a uniform scale of salaries and this is borne out by complaints to the Treasury from the staff of the British Museum. In 1861, a Standing Committee suggested various changes in salaries based on the report (12.1.61) of a sub-committee of finance which said wages at the Museum were too low. It also said that there were too few high offices for assistants to rise to, which discouraged them and caused dissatisfaction;

"long and meritorious services" should be encouraged by rapid promotion and gradual increases in salary. (PP , 1866, p.207.)

The sub-committee's findings had followed correspondence between British Museum assistants and the Treasury. The assistants noted the rises and new scheme of salaries introduced the Trustees and approved by the Treasury. These were:

1st class assistants - £300 p.a. (from £210)

2nd class assistants - £200 p.a. (from £150)

The assistants, however, complained about the money for those in long service (especially those who relied solely on their wages for income) and how they were in a worse position than other government officers. They quoted some figures; the PRO and Audit Office had three scales:

1st class - £400-500

2nd class - £300-350

3rd class - £250 (maximum)

- and in the Admiralty, War Office and Paymaster General's Office;

1st class - £520-800

2nd class - £315-500

3rd class - £300 (maximum)

The British Museum assistants stressed the public importance of their duties compared to other offices, and said that whenever they told the Treasury of their dissatisfactions about money and holidays they had the support of heads of departments. There were 47 signatures (many adding BA Oxon, MA, PhD, FLS or FSA). The Treasury reply (PF 3I.8.60, p 205) rebuffed them saying that it never received any petitions for increases in salary "from officers in the civil service of the Crown" unless

supported or forwarded through the principal authorities of the department of the petitioners.

The following year, the Standing Committee recommended changes that led more and more to a system of rewards and promotions advocated by the assistants. The First Class assistants' Grade was to be divided into upper and lower. Entrance to the upper grade was to depend not on *length* of service, but on quality. The scale of the upper was to be £320-400 p.a. and the lower, £210-310. The latter was to rise in yearly increments of £20. Assistant keepers were to get £425 with annual increases of £25 to reach a maximum of £475. As for Second Class assistants, they were to have £150 per annum with increments of £10 to reach £200. Panizzi wrote to the Treasury to inform it of these suggestions and that the trustees approved the idea of superior merit being rewarded by promotion. The Treasury reply (9.2.61), approved the First Class assistant's salary but said it should be limited to 16 posts. It also approved the Second Class wage, but thought £20 a year too much; £15 was thought more appropriate. They also thought that the time it took assistant keepers to reach a maximum was too rapid and fixed a salary instead at £450 per annum. The Treasury concluded that Panizzi's assurances had influenced the decision to improve the condition of the assistants. Assistants would rise through merit and good service alone, and the Treasury relied "upon your endeavours to impress upon the heads of departments, the necessity of requiring, in return for the increased remuneration granted, zealous and constant work in the Museum in the duties of the establishment."

Further, no other increases in expenditure (including salaries) were to be given without contacting the Treasury first.

A report from Panizzi (22.2.61), referred to a Trustees Minute of 1851 in which the importance of daily attendance was emphasised and the "punctual discharge of their (officers) respective duties." It shows that even before the Northcote-Trevelyan report, laxity had been noted in the British Museum and that regularity was being pushed.

The trustees relied on the "good sense of the officers and were assured that "from now on" attendance would be regular. Thus it was not necessary to "adopt any of those stringent regulations which are in force in many departments of the Government for insuring the daily presence and continuance at his post of each individual officer." .. Heads of Departments should report *every* instance of irregularity to the trustees. Ten years later, Panizzi believed this was still relevant.

The question of salaries continued to cause dissatisfaction. Although the *assistants* wrote to thank the Treasury . . ., there were some in higher posts who were disgruntled. In 1864, the Keeper of the Botanical Department was a Mr. Bennett who had succeeded a Mr. Brown. The latter had had £350 per annum for a 4 day week and 17 weeks holiday, whereas, Mr. Bennett had only 8 weeks holiday for the same pay and had worked in the Museum for 37 years. The Standing Committee of Trustees recommended that Bennet should get £500 per annum to give him parity with other keepers and asked the Treasury for extra cash. What transpired is an example of how wages in the civil service became regularised. Panizzi wrote to the Treasury about Bennett's claim (15.12.54 p.222) and referred to 1857 when Sir Charles Trevelyan and Mr. Arbuthnot "investigated the nature of the duties performed by the different officers and servants in the British Museum, and reported that, as the Botanical Department was then on a provisional footing, they would not offer an opinion as to the

keeper's salary." When Brown died in 1858, the "peculiar circumstances of the arrangement" of his hours and so forth, did not get passed on and Bennett complied with other Keepers' hours and holidays.

The Treasury approved the rise and were again influenced by Panizzi's personal recommendation. Requests went through him and were not always approved by him. In 1865, transcribers at the Museum wrote to him asking for more money for long service, because house rents and food prices had risen and because some had got married. They said - "we are all much straitened in means." Panizzi's general tone was one of disapproval. He dismissed the fact that some were married by saying that they had known the salary when they entered the service and that some had even married after entering it. The Treasury refused the request. One introduced for lower grades, the higher grades felt aggrieved not to be included in a system of rewards for long service. The Assistant Keepers and Keepers wanted more money and this addition for length of service.

Campbell states there was no uniform scale of salaries in the following decade. There were complaints of injustice in "Parliament and elsewhere" which prompted the Government to set up a civil Service Enquiry Commission. Sir Lyon Playfair was Chairman, (there was only one other M.P. and the rest were, or had been, Civil Servants.) It came out in favour of open competition, and grading of posts. Recommendations for uniformity of salaries and their raising by increments, was accepted by Government and adopted in the Civil Service. (See Sutherland, p.39-43). 1972, Discontent was still there, however, due to differences between departments, but by the end of the 19th Century, principles of greater uniformity between departments and open competition (in the Lower

Division) was generally operating. The Higher Division, however, still had channels of patronage and posts were often filled through limited competition.

By 1870, "Young men recruited from an upper-middle class education, looked upon the service as a career and shaped it as a unified profession. The 'professional amateur' had arrived." [Sutherland, 1972, p.138]. The increasing passivity of Civil Servants can be linked to the career hierarchy and a desire not to rock the boat to the rising degree of social homogeneity. [*Introductory Studies in the Growth of 19th Century Government* -Sutherland, 1972,p9) This suggests that the Civil Service was becoming their own and "Whatever the formal methods of selection, bright young gentlemen from Oxford and Cambridge predominated: and one of the preoccupations of the MacDonnell Commission in 1912-14 was the social and educational exclusiveness of the service." (Sutherland, 1972, p10)

This exclusiveness sometimes created tension between local and central staff. [See Sutherland, 1972, p.263-85]. This was a class issue in which the Department's inspectors, the H.M.I.'s, were critical of the elementary teaching staff which generally came from working or lower middle class backgrounds. One episode illustrated central government attitudes against education at a local level. In 1908, the Chief H.M.I. Edmond Holmes, sent a circular to his staff inquiring about the local inspectorate. From the evidence, it seemed that 104 out of 123 of the local inspectors were ex-elementary teachers and that a mere handful had had the benefit of a 'liberal education'; that is, had been to either Oxford or Cambridge, or a public school. It was concluded that the latter were more efficient and that elementary teachers "are as a rule uncultured and imperfectly educated." It advocated the pensioning off of local inspectors

so that each could be replaced by "men of real culture and enlightenment" who was a "varsity man" with the virtue of detachment. . . . Although not for publication, the Memorandum was leaked. The National Union of Teachers protested and the Permanent Secretary resigned. A former minister said that the circular was based on a sincere attempt at providing a properly conducted education. It was an embarrassing blow to the image of impartiality. Later, Holmes, who had a reputation as a "generous, humane and enlightened man" , wrote of his years as an Inspector in the 1870's and 80's:

For me, they were so many examinees and as they all belonged to the 'lower orders' and as (according to the belief in which I had been allowed to grow up) the lower orders were congenitally inferior to the 'upper classes', I took little or no interest in my examinees either as individuals or as human beings, and never tried to explore their hidden depths. Indeed, the idea of their having hidden depths was foreign to my way of thinking ...
[from *In Quest of an Ideal London* 1920, p64, Sutherland, 1972, p275)

In her Introduction to *Studies in the Growth of 19th Century Government* Sutherland notes the "peculiarly English, negative view of the state" : which she gives as one of the reasons for passivity among the civil servants after 1870. Here, however, we see that even if this was the case, it did not stop them imposing their cultural and social notions of superiority on the local educational set up. Later, we shall discuss the working class view of the state.

Central and Local Rule

In 1884, T.H.S. Escott discussed a growing state bureaucracy and its responsibility to local government. The question, he said, was perplexing and not yet answered, and was this:

Is the State, in addition to its duties as the champion of the different communities that live under it, to fulfil the function of an accommodating money-lender on easy terms, for the carrying out of local improvements? What is the exact point at which the state is under an obligation to relieve local rates out of imperial taxation, and when and why does that obligation cease?
[Escott, 1885, p.3. See Chapter 5 above for the Parliamentary debates about levying money to set up local museums,]

Throughout, we have spoken of central and local government and their relationship. This relationship is never simple and although they may co-exist, they can both be described as a "confused pattern of growth and decay." [Roberts' 68p14 ; B. & S. Webbs *English Local Government Statutory Authorities* 1922, p.353-4]. From Elizabethan times, government passed economic and social legislation and grew empirically, but it was not until the 19th Century that it created "central agencies to enforce its decrees" much more having previously been left to local discretion. One writer, however, still feels that:

We simply do not know enough yet to decide whether local authorities can be discussed in the same terms as government departments, But their peculiar financial problems and their peculiar vulnerability to local concerns and struggles may well mean that they ought to be treated separately,
[G. Sutherland, 1972, pp.8-9]

The picture is further complicated by differences within the regions themselves and perhaps it is here that the answer to the difficulties of the relationship of central to local government and vice versa, lies; some

recent work has been done, (for example, J. Foster 1974). It has long been known that local governments differed and work currently being done to shed light on the reasons for these differences includes research by D. Smith of Leicester University into Birmingham and Sheffield. In a paper presented at the University of Keele (11.2.80), entitled *The Development of 19th Century Capitalism and Education*, he stated his main interest as being why the class struggle manifested itself in the way it did and why and how institutions influenced this development. Comparing their situations, Smith found that in Birmingham, there was a more complex occupational structure and nationally important economy so that local grievances tended to aggregate into general issues. There was also a high sense of civic pride. Birmingham was the scene of political and religious confrontation over education, had a grammar school tradition and, in the 1880's, technical education at secondary level was introduced. (Now published: Dennis Smith, *Conflict and Compromise; Class formation in English Society 1830-1904*. 1982). Sheffield was smaller and more isolated, consisting of a collection of villages with its commerce still predominantly tied up in aristocratic interests. It was generally against mechanization as the workforce was still craft oriented and whereas in Birmingham, the whole of a family could be out at work in the factory, work in Sheffield was more household based. It also had small, strong trade unions. In Birmingham, greater educational provision led to more professionals and its university was the first to break with the Oxbridge model and base its curriculum on science.

Smith believes that this is really an analysis between the old and new order; the former characterised by the county and neighbourhood, dominated by the aristocracy and petit bourgeoisie, and the latter by the

manufacturing bourgeoisie and the development of municipal institutions and the town council. The development of the manufacturing middle class of Birmingham led to confrontation (1830's-70's) between itself and the older established Anglicans who were county oriented. And the growth of education as part of the development of municipal institutions is, according to Smith, one of the spheres in which the middle class jockeyed for position.(cf.Manchester below). E.P. Hennock has also done a comparative study of municipal government in Leeds and Birmingham - (Review by P. Thane, *Victorian Studies* Dec. 1975 Vol. XI No. 2 p.272-4 of E.P. Hennock *Fit and Proper Persons: Ideal and Reality in Nineteenth Century Urban Government.* : 1973). Hennock sees municipal government as having more impact on peoples lives in the 19th Century because it grew faster than central government and had to deal with new urban and industrial problems as they arose. As we saw with Manchester, local government in Leeds and Birmingham was a forum for class struggle and control of policing. Municipal reform in Leeds and Birmingham did not immediately alter the distribution of power, but, as the corporation gained influence, it became more interesting to employers. In Birmingham, Chamberlain formulated (with business associations), a policy of efficient central control working for prosperous ratepayers. Profitable utilities were "municipalised" (gas, water), and the profits used to build smart civic buildings and clear slums. This did not begin to happen in Leeds until the 1890's, when the tradesmen and radical shopkeepers, who were against too much local intervention, were ousted by bigger businessmen. Thus it seems that the industrially developed town with its manufacturing middle class, would have been seen as nationally more important and

through them more eager to reorganise its government which, as we saw in Manchester, led to more ready interference in local matters.

Other measures taken by central government, however, were designed to implement a uniform system nationally. The Poor Law Amendment Act set up a London based controlling body to supervise the districts which one writer sees as the "start of central control over the detailed administration of local services." [P.G. Richards 1975 p.15-16].

Class and the State

Central decisions were seen by some, including radicals, socialists and Tories, as an alien imposition against self-rule, or if too much interference, as repressive control. Social investigations often highlighted general urban problems which were tackled unevenly. The General Board of Health, for example, established in 1848, had Chadwick as its main executive officer and it was agreed to with reluctance. Main objections centred on its tendency to take autonomy away from municipal corporations and its centralising power, but, " ... only one heavy recurrent mortality from cholera, among the rich as well as the poor, sufficed to get Parliament to acquiesce." [Cole & Postgate, 1966, p.358]. When the danger was over, however, and the act up for renewal, it was dissolved. And later, in 1871, when the Local Government Board was set up, the powers of local government were consolidated and by 1875, all areas, rural and urban, had authorities responsible for sanitation under the supervision of a central government department.

Roberts says that in the 19th Century, the British administrative state was developed as a result of attempts to remedy social evils and that the picture is generally one in which the early part of the century was one of growing collectivisation halted in the '50's. Between the '50's and the '70's, he sees more of an emphasis on local government and the late 19th and early 20th Century as a time of consolidation with the years after 1905 showing a greater willingness on the part of the government to interfere in 'economic abuses.'(Roberts, 1968, p.95). But the impression that those who took decisions were eager to set up a planned or centralised state is a false one. Centralisation of powers was often against the will of those involved and the Whigs have been described as the "improving architects of that most rambling of structures, the Victorian administrative state."(p.99). Their reforms are often described as ad hoc and pragmatic, responding only to proven facts (amply provided by the investigators). But the fact was that inspectors could collect facts and find their recommendations thrown out by Parliament, shows that Parliament could act by principles when it did not legislate and when it did. (Principles could be appealed too, however, if it could be shown that, for example, education was necessary to security and social peace. The Benthamites found that Parliament was often a negative voice.) Gradually, however, government turned more and more to positive legislation.

Frazer states that the pragmatism of government reform was also paradoxically married to the ethics of self-help and individualism which coexisted with, or survived, greater local and national government. As we have seen, the upper classes were prepared to be more or less pragmatic, depending on the situation or matter and this is the hallmark of

utilitarianism. Frazer gives a "long and well-known quotation" dating from 1902, which is also curiously applicable for the 19th Century:

The individualist town councillor will walk along the municipal pavement, lit by municipal gas and cleansed by municipal brooms and municipal water, and seeing by the municipal clock in the municipal market that he is too early to meet his children coming from the municipal school, hard by the county lunatic asylum and municipal hospital, will use the national telegraph system to tell them not to walk through the municipal park, but to come by the municipal tramway to meet him at the municipal reading-room by the municipal art gallery, museum and library where he intends to consult one of the national publications to prepare his next speech in the municipal town hall in favour of the nationalisation of canals and the increase of Government control over the railway system. 'Socialism, Sir,' he will say, 'don't waste the time of a practical man by your fantastic absurdities. Self-help, Sir, individual self-help, that's what made our city what it is.'

[Fraser 1976 p104 from *The Times* 23 Aug. 1902]

A later development in local government which must be mentioned is the increasing involvement of the working class and their supporters. Lovett had noticed, in the 1830's, how the middle class had used municipal reform for their own ends and was suspicious of local government that was not working class, saying - "we have men in our municipal corporations who at one time were the greatest advocates of reform; they have now realised all the reform they wished for, and therefore are the greatest opponents of further reform." [Lovett, 1920, p.191].

Indeed, when the Bradford Labour Party began in 1891, its main purpose was to "further the cause of direct Labour representation in local bodies and in Parliament." [J.F.C. Harrison, 1961, p.254].

By the end of 1892, Bradford City Council had one Labour Party member and the Halifax Council had four. One successful candidate had given up a managerial career to devote all his time to improving the conditions of the working class. Although numerically small, "wherever

they were elected, the Independent Labour Party local councillors, armed with the latest Fabian tracts, kept up constant pressure for the exercise of such limited municipal powers as were available ... and to the working classes it showed Labour as the one party which could and would give relief where the shoe pinched ... "[225], Pat Thane, however, has shown that the picture is not as clear cut as this, although working class people who may have been suspicious of the State were more sympathetic to local government. She describes how Pelling argued that lack of support for State Welfare among the working classes, was due to suspicions that Government worked for the rich and against Trade Unions, social interventions were often unpalatable and the fact that the working classes had feelings of independence and self-help. (P. Thane 1984).

Thane, however, describes the working class as "heterogeneous." She attempts to describe some of their viewpoints about the State using Trade Unions, Friendly Societies, Co-ops and political organisations which, although often run by the middle class and the better paid working class, stand as influential components of society (at least more so than individuals). (Thane, 1984, p.878). There is a description of the frequent debate in Friendly Societies about State provisions. In the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows, for example, (with, in 1899, 1,713,000 members) the dominant view was for self-help which was seen as *morally* preferable to State handouts. This view, that the State was getting too strong, was also shared by Temperance Societies. The second largest, (660,000 members in 1899) was the Ancient Order of Foresters, which argued against State provision, as they saw it as a way for employers to evade decent wages and regular work. There was, however, a minority view for State welfare and taxation, but the main argument was for retaining independence and

saving and against charity. To rob one of responsibility is to degrade. This independence was seen as being possible through the *collectivist* channel of the society (in the same way as higher wages can be achieved through a strike).

The SDF, 1890's TUC and Trade Councils mostly favoured State action. The SDF did, in the knowledge that generally there was a lack of working class support for revolutionary change, that it could give some real benefits and they emphasised their priorities for reform - for example, Housing, education etc. They also saw local government as a chance to introduce some socialism and influence the working classes. The TUC, says Thane, consisted now of poorer workers who would have been more sympathetic to State help and the Trade Councils favoured more local solutions and tried to weigh up short term gains against long term losses. The ILP, too, preferred local reform, but were critical that Government reforms were limited. The Women's Co-operative Guild (f.1893), is mentioned by Thane who says they had a pragmatic approach to State reform. One of the demands of their members (32,000 in 1914), was to have the 30 shilling maternity benefit which was won in 1913 and recognised as the property of the mother; (see Margaret Llewelyn Davies Ed. *Maternity: Letters from Working Women* 1915. Intro. Gloden Dallas London 1978). Thane says there *was* resentment about "measures which entailed 'intrusion' into working-class lives and homes ... [which] seemed to imply that poor people needed the guidance of their betters ... "[Thane, 1984, p.893]. These included health visitors at the turn of the century and compulsory education and the Attendance Officer. The latter could cause financial hardship. Paul Thompson, in the review of *The Lost Elementary Schools of Victorian England*, London 1984 [In N.Soc. 6.2.84

Vol. 70 No. 1461 describes how popular fee paying schools were among the working class in the mid-'70's, after Forster's Act. In Bristol, a quarter of the working class children went to them and they were often superior to State schools in that they did not insist on drilling or offer middle-class moralilty or harsh regimes. They were destroyed by an Act in 1876, which prohibited independent schools giving pupils a 'labour certificate' needed to get jobs up to the age of 13.

The growth of State intervention is often individualised around such people as Kay and Chadwick, but the measures arising out of the efforts of the middle class in government can be seen as having a coherence in terms of, ultimately, the protection of individual capital. This is apparent in the parliamentary debates over museum legislation as we shall see later. At the very least, the rationale of industrial competition was used to rally parliamentary support. Arguments of social sobriety, education etc., were also used. What is interesting is this two-pronged argument. We hope that the later study of museums and local and central government will throw light on these elements of control, and, in the following chapter, the relationship between the state and capitalism. There will also be a discussion of other forms of leisure activities of the 19th Century working class with their mixture of traditional custom, growing urban commercialization and government legislation and controls.

Notes

- [1] One commentator noted how in Leeds and Birmingham "ladies organise themselves into social as well as religious missionaries for the benefit of the working classes. They endeavour to inculcate the laws

of hygiene, the rudiments of wholesome cookery, the simple laws of domestic economy upon the dwellers in the poorest districts of the town..." T.H.S. Escott, 1885, p.92.

- [2] This is similar to the idea of making the YTS compulsory.
- [3] Charles Shaw described the situation in Tunstall and said: "There was a potency in the word 'constable' which I have never seen in the word policeman. But we live in progressive times." Before "The time of the bobbies" There were two constables, both cobblers, who observed St Monday but who would go in to break up fights or dog-fights. Sometimes the constables were called for by women or they heard the fights. Generally, says Shaw, a cry of "The constable is coming", dispersed a crowd but he saw it have no effect on colliers who had a "riot" as part of their strike: "These men had marched to a colliery with the purpose of destroying whatever they could... While engaged in this work, a cry came that "the constable was coming." And so he did, and expecting, as usual, that the crowd would disperse, he boldly ran into the thick of it. But nobody gave way. Nobody was afraid. The men were too numerous and too grimly in earnest and so when the constable attempted to hinder their destructive work, two or three of the men seized him and carried him to a large water pit, and threw him in as if he had been a dog." [31-33] They would not let him emerge until he was completely exhausted and he crawled home. The colliers then finished destroying the engine house and other pit property.
- [4] See Chap 5 above for a description of Mechanics' Institutes related to education for industry and the role of museums in this. Also see; Parliamentary Papers 1835, 375.
- [5] More efforts were made in the coming years including the University Extension Scheme which used touring Oxford and Cambridge lecturers and the W.E.A. at the turn of the century. See J.F.C. Harrison, 1961, Ch VI-VIII.
- [6] Some had more or less overt political positions which they did not hide Parriss, 1969, *Constitutional Bureaucracy* pp. 66-67. This was later discouraged as the civil servant was to be seen to be disinterested.
- [7] The actual figures of the number of civil servants in the last century are, says G.A. Campbell, (*The Civil Service In Britain* p. 45) only available "to a limited extent". The Northcote-Trevelyan report says in 1853 that there were "not less than 16,000", but as Campbell points out, this figure omitted casual and minor workers. Campbell says that during the Crimean War total staff was nearly 40,000 "and when the 1860 Committee was appointed the total establishment in the clerical grades seems to have been about 38,000." Weber also characterizes bureaucratic structures as self perpetuating; "Once established and having fulfilled its task, an office tends to continue in existence and be held by another incumbent." (M. Weber, 1968, p. 67 - Chap 7 'Bureacracy')

[8] E.g., Sir Charles Eastlake. In 1855 he was given £1,000 p.a. as Director of the National Gallery.

CHAPTER 2.

Time	105.
Blood Sports and Fairs	115.
Fairs and Wakes	119.
Pubs and Drink	128.
Temperance	136.
The Working Men's Club Movement	148.
The Music Halls	152.
Notes	182.

In their book *Time to Spare in Victorian England*, John Lowerson and John Myerscough describe what they call a leisure revolution which involved an increase in time away from work, more variety of leisure pursuits and a change in the ways of spending time and money on them. Time, variety and money all offered opportunities which caused a leisure revolution. This does not mean that it happened overnight. Equally, it did not simply evolve. Elias sees changing leisure and sports activities as part of the process whereby people are civilised. He noted (Vol. 1. p.204), that different times have societies that find different pursuits acceptable and pleasurable; burning cats may have been seen so at one time, but now the idea is seen in many places as horrific. The idea, however, that the lower classes were dissolute, was not invented in the 19th Century. In 1752, a Bill for preventing robberies and regulating Places of Public Entertainment, was passed. (*Parliamentary History of England*, Cobbett, 14, 1747-1753 p.1234-5). The common people were profligate and it was time for legal restraint. Time, money and morals were dissipated and robberies very frequent. The Bill was for London and a 20 mile radius and required licences to be taken out before any entertainment rooms for music or dancing were opened. The Lords wanted to make it a nationwide law, but as the The Commons did not want to incur taxes on the population it kept its original form. Morality and crime were mentioned, but not education or institutions designed to help stop the profligacy.

Changing leisure activities did alter the quality of peoples lives (and were often as not *for* the people and as we shall see later this is the point where middle-class commercial interests and 'improvement' reformers meet in the attitude of providers). To take Lowerson's and Myerscough's emphasis would, perhaps, be going one step ahead of ourselves, for the changes in time, leisure and money which they describe were not part of a self-generating process and could not have occurred without the changes described in Chapter One. Having recognised a new development (industrialisation) and its effects on social and industrial relations, my emphasis will now focus upon the variety of leisure activities that were both emerging, dying or being destroyed.

As we saw in the previous Chapter, the middle-class ideal of the free market economy which was supposed eventually to cure working class ills and to foster greater independence, was an ideal to which they did not always adhere in social matters. Charity and limited government action were applied and gradually seen as necessary to uphold the economic system. Both expanded (and in some cases, charitable tasks were eventually taken over by the government, for example, the COS) thereby creating the machinery by which the local government could provide services previously seen as part of the middle-class 'moral improvement' movement for the working classes - for example, libraries and adult education. Up until the end of the 19th Century, most recreation facilities were, or were becoming, commercial, charitable and/or church run and traditional celebrations were mutating, dying or being persecuted out of existence. These are the changes we will describe. Many were not the direct result of the industrial revolution, but of the changes in

lifestyles and middle-class morality coming out of the industrial and economic developments.

As one historian says, for the middle-classes, the problem of leisure was generally the problem of working-class leisure.[P. Bailey, 1977 p.8] ¹. And as with improvement ventures the solution had to include contact between the classes and a 'contact on *their* terms, which would control working class leisure and recreation.' [Donajrodzki, 1977, 143] There was no doubt which class was supposed to benefit from such contact, civilizing came from above down to those below. The exhortation was as we have seen, to 'be *like* me,' but please maintain the respect due to one's betters. Class divisions based on wealth were here to stay. The idea was one based on positions of tutelage and superiority which gave them the right to go and interfere in working class areas. (When, however, the working class encroached on middle class territory, the latter were offended, e.g., seaside resorts[Bailey 1977, p. 13])²

The reason why working class leisure was a problem was not simply one of disgust at proletarian habits, but involved questions of social norms and fears of that ever possible social catastrophe. The disgust, however, served to underline the fears and was in itself a sign of one's class. Descriptions of working class crowds could be passionate; the working class 'vomited forth' and as Storch remarks crowds were feared for their 'potential for mischief and destruction, whatever the purpose they assembled for: a fair or wake, a Chartist demonstration, shopping or even going to or returning from work.' [Donajrodzki, 1977, Storch's essay 'The Problem of Working Class Leisure: Some Roots of Middle Class Moral Reform in the Industrial North 1825-1850' p. 140. He refers one to W. Cooke Taylor, *Notes on a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of*

Manchester 2nd Ed., London, 1842, pp. 6-7 and J. P. Kay *The Moral and Physical Condition...* pp. 42-31

Laissez-faire, both legislatively and socially through various reform agencies (which often had government backing, for example, educational charities, - see previous chapter) was impossible in the sphere of non-occupational time, thus the reform activities and legislation concerning pubs and fairs. The activities of leisure time, represented for the middle class, all the other problems of civil order, morality and labour discipline. Moreover, leisure or 'free' time was seen as the time within which people had the greatest freedom of choice, and, away from the often quite stringent work discipline and good influence of their betters, working class people met others of the same class in what were seen as excitable atmospheres. Thus it should come as no great surprise that such efforts were made to link work and leisure. 'Work and play were antithetical in form only; in purpose they were part of a single natural process in which work was sovereign. Work disciplines had to be projected into play, not vice versa.' [P. Bailey 1977, p. 22. He makes the same point in his *Leisure and Class...* 1978 p. 9.] Recreation by this reasoning was, therefore, another occupation or employment and an ally of work, not an independent activity [see de Grazia p. 308] With work as the main referent, recreation was to be, as the word suggests, the re-creation of one's energies, physical and mental, for the next bout of work, or as one clergyman explained "recreation" is the re-creation, the creation anew of fresh strength for tomorrow's work.' [Rev. John Clarke, *Plain Papers on the Social Economy* London, 1858. in P. Bailey 1977, p. 22.] Bailey describes how some middle class saw working class free time as a luxury [p. 14] and as a waste of productive time. Work was also a natural or moral law

or necessity; ideally, a worker should be law-abiding, conscientious and take a pride in his work. This, according to one clergyman, is the true path to happiness and such a worker, 'lives in a loyal obedience to the immutable law, "In the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread," so that innate instinct ... there is no harvest for those who neither plough or sow.' [Dean Hole, 1893, p. 152]

In his article 'Time, Work Discipline and Industrial Capital' E.P. Thompson quotes a "moralist" writing as early as 1821, who is alarmed at the inactivity of the working classes after working hours; they just lounge around 'yielded up to utter vacancy and torpor' or are impertinent to passers-by. [John Foster *An Essay on the Evils of Popular Ignorance* London, 1821 pp. 180-5 in Thompson 1963 p. 90] Thompson remarks 'this clearly, was worse than Bingo: non-productive activity, compounded with impertinence. In mature capitalist society all time must be consumed, marketed, put to ~~use~~; it is offensive for the labour force merely to "pass the time". [E.P. Thompson 1967 p. 90]

Time

The rationalisation of time and, with it, work and non-work time into an hourly, weekly and annual pattern according to the needs of industry, was not accomplished overnight. Lowerson and Myerscough 1977 say that in 1801, 90% of the population of Sussex lived in the countryside and that work, play and recreation intermingled in a cycle made up of holy days and festivals, which by the 1840s had mostly been eradicated. That industrial capitalism was successful in establishing new

patterns of work meant a change both in the quantity and quality of time spent at work and away from work.

Both in and outside work there developed greater uses of visual and auditory signals to regulate people to the needs of 19th century capitalism. There were bells, hooters, clocks and clock towers. Sebastian de Grazia [1962] notes how the word for clock comes from the Celtic word Clocca meaning a bell tower which was an early method for synchronising activities. Mechanical clocks and watches, however, became more refined and widespread in the 19th century. De Grazia asks why they did not remain fascinating toys and why they became so widely used when they did. They were fairly expensive, but they ~~were~~ necessary. Factory whistles were used and clocks hung in work places and clock towers erected in towns and cities, often as civic celebrations of national events. The synchronisation of time made possible through clocks, enabled greater coordination of the movement of men and machinery so important to industry. Time was further rationalised by the developing transport system.

Early on in the 19th century it was not only the dislike of clock time governing work that rankled with workers, but also the fact that the factory system, with its rationalised work patterns, interfered with a work life that had had variety and a personal time rhythm. For the domestic weavers, for example, factory timetabling interfered with their whole way of life. As E.P. Thompson shows;

They resented, first, the discipline, the factory bell or hooter; the time-keeping which overrode ill-health, domestic arrangements, or the choice of more varied occupations. William Child, a journeyman weaver victimised for his activities with 'The Institution' of 1806, refused to enter a handloom factory because of his objections to "being confined to go exactly at such an hour and such a minute, and the bad conduct that was carried on there, A tender man when he had his work

at home could do it at his leisure; there you must come at the time; the bell rings at half-past-five, and then again at six, then ten minutes was allowed for the door to be opened; if eleven expired, it was shut against any person either man, woman, or child; there you must stand out of doors or return home until eight,...

[Quoted from the Committee on the Wollen Trade 1806 p. 111 in Thompson 1963 pp. 337-8]

Even later on in the century there are examples of workers choosing shorter hours rather than more money and piece rate workers knocking off when they had earned enough. In 1867, in Newcastle, stonemasons struck for shorter hours. Higher wages were offered if they would accept the old hours. 401 out of 422 voted for the shorter hours. Many workers created their own free time in the form of St Monday. Between 1841-1846 the majority of railway excursions took place on a Monday, (D.A. Reid, 1976, p. 82). Most of them were organised by Friendly Societies and Monday was a popular day for Mechanics' Institute exhibitions and sport. It began to die out with the greater use of machinery and factory discipline. Reid links the half-day Saturday holiday and the erosion of St Monday. The former was introduced at different dates in different places and the giving up of the latter was used as an argument for wanting the half-day Saturday. Once given, the half-day Saturday was used to impose more regularity on workers, and, in overall hours, the workers lost free time. St Monday, however, persisted longest in the small, unmechanised workplace but also where "The unanimity of the men in upholding customary ways was sufficient to overcome the opposition of the owners." (1976, p. 91) Reid makes the point that, whatever the work context, it was the skilled man who persisted in observing St Monday. There were, however, examples of it in unskilled jobs which had no mechanization. In Birmingham women took time off from the button and

glass-and-emery paper trades. Reid asserts that the dying out of St Monday was detrimental "to the actual and potential quality of working class life." [Reid, 1976:101] He quotes from Aris's *Birmingham Gazette* 15.6.53 which describes a meeting of half-holiday campaigners;

There were present that evening employers and employed,... Ministers and people, those who had obtained and those who had granted the holiday, all rejoicing together in the possession of a mutual benefit, and the watchword of that assembly was "progress".
[From a speech by Henry Wright, rolling stock manufacturer]

Marx recognised the importance of greater quantities of free time if meaningful and human activities were to be given a chance. "If a people is to increase its spiritual freedom, it cannot longer remain in the thrall of its bodily needs, it can no longer be the servant of the flesh. Above all it needs time for intellectual exercise and recreation." [Marx, 1975, p. 250] He also believed that money incentives to increase hours as in times of prosperity simply lead to overwork and a great loss of time and freedom. Work is simply a means to satisfy needs outside itself and is not 'his own spontaneous activity' which involves a loss of self:

The result is that man [the worker] feels that he is acting freely only in his animal functions - eating, drinking and procreating, or at most in his dwelling and adornment - while in his human functions he is nothing more than an animal.

It is true that eating, drinking and procreating, etc., are also genuine human functions. However, when abstracted from other aspects of human activity and turned into final exclusive ends, they are animal.

[Marx, 1975, p. 327]

'Animal' here, of course, is a pejorative term. This quote from Marx, however, describes a relationship between work and non-work time brought about by the alienation of work. 'Free' time under the conditions of what he terms 'forced labour' can only be a misnomer. Indeed, according to

Marx, political economy (by which he says he means empirical businessmen) does not regard the worker as anything other than 'the worker' and labour is simply a wage earning activity. "It [political economy] does not consider him, during the time when he is not working, as a human being. It leaves this to criminal law, doctors, religion, statistical tables, politics and the beadle." [Marx, 1975, p. 288] All the discomforts of work were put into a rigid system by the impersonal routine of the clock and this was part and parcel of the passing away of traditional responsibilities between masters and workers. "Time is money" went the saying, and no-one was in any doubt about whose time was worth more. Time, like money, can be counted exactly - twenty four hours in a day and twenty shillings in the pound. Marx discovers the value put upon time, both the price put upon the labourer's time by the employer and the abstract quality of value in human terms.

The capitalist, it seems, therefore, *buys* their labour with money. They *sell* him their labour for money. But this is merely the appearance. In reality what they sell to the capitalist for money is their labour *power*. The capitalist buys this labour power for a day, a week, a month etc., and after he has bought it, he uses it by having the workers work for the stipulated time. For the same sum with which the capitalist has bought their labour power, for example, two marks, he could have bought two pounds of sugar or a definite amount of any other commodity. The two marks, with which he bought two pounds of sugar are the *price* of the two pounds of sugar. The two marks with which he bought twelve hours use of labour power, are the price of twelve hours labour. Labour power, therefore, is a commodity, neither more nor less than sugar. The former is measured by the clock, the latter by the scales.
[Marx, 1976, p. 19]

The time, therefore, that is used to sell the labour power is also a commodity and its price set by forces over which the labourer has no control.

Alienated labour, as expressed by Marx, is a description of the social relations under capitalism as is his equation of value and labour. Value is *not* price as it was for his contemporary political economists (Ollman, 1977, p. 174). Value is a product of capitalist society reflecting the social relations within it and is generally confused with price. (Some things have a price but no value because they are not products of labour eg., land) Value and labour are synonymous and under capitalism express exploitation. The capitalist puts a price on time and pays the worker for his labour, power and time, but not for the product he or she has produced. The value of the commodity is in its "congealed labour time" and not in its price. [*Capital I* p. 39, Ollman, 1977, p166)

Elsewhere Marx says "labour is life and if life is not exchanged every day for food it suffers and soon perishes. If human life is to be regarded as a commodity, we are forced to admit slavery." [Marx, 1975, p. 293] Thus, the capitalist puts a price on a worker's time. And if he or she was not working they would be doing something else. Marx believed that in 19th century industrial capitalism a worker only felt himself when he was at home (it was different for women workers for whom home was yet another work place). "He is at home when he is not working and not at home when he is working". [Marx, 1975, p. 326] At work the worker is conditioned and controlled by the needs of capital affecting the quality and quantity of time at the job, but does this relate to the way time is spent away from work?

In his book *Alienation* Bertell Ollman says that the human result of alienation shows itself in both the mind and person of the worker. He uses a quote from Hegel included by Marx in *Capital*, to illustrate some of the effects of alienation:

I may make over to another the use for a limited time, of my particular bodily and mental aptitudes and capabilities; because in consequence of this restriction, they are impressed with a character of alienation with regard to me as a whole. But by the alienation of all my labour time and the whole of my work, I should be converting the substance of itself, in other words, my general activity and reality, my person, into the property of another.
[*Capital* I 168, p. 306, n.11 Ollman, 1977, p166)

The insidious nature of the new industrial relations and bourgeois ideology was the pretence that work was a free, equal exchange, whereas the position of the worker was more precarious than before. This idea of a free exchange was part of the philosophy of self-help and the individual's responsibility for how he or she spent time, meant leisure time as well. Therefore, if a person spent a lot of time in the pub it was that person's fault if any misery resulted. Of course, there were self improvement ideas and schemes by both the middle class and within the working classes and both advocated a '*better*' use of non-work time. For the latter, however, they were generally seen as a necessity and the former as answers to a problem that could prove dangerous for them and society.

Holidays also involved class issues and here a brief discussion is needed as they were part of the non-work time spent by workers. Holidays were a direct result of the newly established work rhythms and despite resistance the introduction of new holidays had to be accomplished by neutralising time into interchangeable parts. It was helpful in a Protestant country such as Britain, that the hundred or so holy and saints days could and were pared away. [Lowerson and Myerscough, 1977, p. 14] Holidays with pay did not exist until 1938 except for white collar workers in the late 19th century. Hours of work did decrease throughout

the century so that, whereas in the 1820's and 1830's, a seventy-two hour week was common, by 1880 it was more like fifty-four hours. In general, time had lost its diffuse pre-industrial nature and pockets of time were now more in concentrated specialised segments. Time at work determined leisure hours and a lessening of one meant an increase of the other. One of the most vivid descriptions of concentrated character of 'free time' comes from a 20th century writer, Alan Sillitoe, in *Saturday Night, Sunday Morning*:

For it was Saturday night, the best and biggest glad time of the week, one of the 52 holidays in the slow turning Big Wheel of the year, a violent preamble to a prostrate Sabbath, Piled up passions were exploded on Saturday night and the effect of a week's monotonous graft in the factory was swilled out of your system in a burst of good will, [1958, p. 5]

Returning to the middle class identification of work and leisure, Marx makes the point that the industrial capitalist seeks pleasure as a relaxation *from* work so that leisure is subordinate to production.[Marx, 1975, p. 368] Work is the main aim of life, making time the space in which money is made, time is money and both are limited resources. A professional, a 'barrister at law', baulking against the money grubbing of the middle class, went as far as to say, 'the successful have no leisure, and they who would indulge in leisure must forfeit success'.[William Johnstone, 1851, Vol I, p. 218] He regrets the domination of trade and routine which inhibits the 'flight of genius'. Johnstone believes the world was divided into two groups - the overworked and the idle. He quotes from 'Lago Lugano', a poem by H. Taylor, to express the way he thinks leisure patterns have changed from rural or traditional ways:

Oh England! "Merry England" styled of yore,
Where is thy mirth, thy jocund laughter where?

The sweat of labour on the brow of care
Makes the mute answer - Driven from every door!
The maypole cheers the village green no more;
Nor Harvest Home nor Christmas mummers rare,
The tired mechanic at his lecture sighs;
And of the learned, which with all his lore,
Has leisure to be wise?

Middle class businesslike attitudes spilled over into leisure time in concert with technological developments. As Bailey says, the railway age meant coordination and timetabling of activities. He quotes a contemporary warning against being too methodical and mechanistic in the planning of leisure which was destroying 'carefree leisure'. [Bailey, 1977, 12-13, quoting on pp. 14-15 from the *Saturday Review* 16th June]

Although urban lifestyles which included a more anonymous type of commercial recreation than previously, meant that middle and upper class men could become the 'Jekylls and Hydes' of suburbia, [Bailey, 1977, p. 17] there was much debate within the church to decide which recreations were compatible with a Christian life and to which the middle classes paid some attention. For example, the Congregational Union held two symposia in the 1870's to argue out a revised catalogue of approved leisure activities and the Evangelists disapproved of racing and its gambling connections and billiards among other things, because it was accessible through pubs. Dancing was vetoed by some churches but the veto on the theatre was universal.

The problem of leisure was one which the middle classes could partially solve by stripping it of its 'decadent' connotations and referring to 'recreation', which sounded much more vigorous. Gradually, sports became fashionable among the middle class as a recreation and they were segregated along class lines. Clubs and societies sprang up,

surrounded by all the accoutrements or 'apparatus of leisure', resulting in a more visible leisure which reinforced class identity.[p. 26] In fact, any working class leisure activity, from fairs to sports, pubs and music halls, were criticised, organised, controlled and in some cases even legislated against by the middle class. As E.P. Thompson says, the history of time is the history of exploitation and the resistance to it. This part of the class struggle was also characterised by the concern shown by the middle class to the working class over the latter's spare or leisure time.

Bearing in mind that the working class, in some occupations, showed preferences for leisure time above money and that the middle class wanted to maximise profits from industrial concerns, the ensuing class relations became more and more concerned with ideological and commercial control and less and less with overt control on the part of the middle classes. Of course, overt control was exercised when the above control ceased to function through the police and legislation, especially in times of industrial and political unrest. The area of leisure, however, is one in which the nature of class control is also revealed and this is attempted in the following descriptions of leisure activities, some of which spanned the pre-industrial era to the end of the century and beyond. These include fairs and bloodsports, pubs and Working Men's Clubs, of which the latter gained self-government; sports, holidays, music and the music hall. All bear the marks, in one way or another, and from different times, of middle-class control or attempts at control.

Bloodsports and Fairs

One historian of popular recreations describes how 'Most men of property' applauded the death and decline of many traditional pastimes as 'a sign of progress.' [Malcolmson, 1973, p.89] This hostility was often very powerful, in the sense that it emanated from those in a position to act upon their opposition; these were 'legislators and magistrates, employers and zealous clergymen.' Moreover, these efforts to stamp out various popular recreations, whether bloodsport, wake, fair or football match, were, from the 18th century onwards, nationwide, and were often the scene of bitter class confrontations. As Malcolmson says, although there had been criticisms of bloodsports since Tudor times, it was not until the late 18th and 19th centuries that popular recreations suffered 'systematic and sustained' attack. Early attacks generally centred on the theme of the oppression of beasts and although this objection persisted, it gradually became more and more tinged with class fear and morality. In February of 1859, for example, the Norwich Court of mayoralty, ordered constables to patrol the streets to enforce a ban 'in just abhorrence of the cruel practice of throwing at cocks in this season of the year, and to prevent such disorders as usually arise therefrom.' [p.120] Criticism was also voiced at the parliamentary level and in numerous societies. According to the Hammonds, there were unsuccessful attempts to repress bloodsports between 1800 and 1802, where the main thrust of the arguments in favour of a ban was the tendency towards idleness and disorderliness that such recreations provoked in the working man. (There were some, including Richard Brindley Sheridan, whose main objection to bloodsports was the *cruelty* and he

advocated alternatives, such as cricket.[Hammonds, 1978, p.34-5] A 19th century commentator wrote in 1828 of a meeting of the London Debating Society at the Freemason's Tavern which included J.S. Mill. The subject was the legislation against cruelty to animals and the arguments can be seen as a brief sketch of the main political concerns described earlier.

The speaker in favour of legislation, began his argument with a criticism of the definition of government that saw the purpose of government as the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Government existed rather to further 'the maintenance of social order' and if acts of cruelty towards animals encouraged the propensity to commit other crimes then the government could do nothing to prevent its happening except through legislation in the first place.

The opposing speaker said that the reason he was against legislation was that the end could be achieved by other means such as a good education. And yet another speaker saw the law as useful precisely because the mass of people 'were not sufficiently educated for it to be possible to persuade them to treat animals gently'.[Gustave D'Eichthal, 1977, p. 37]

In parliament, some of those members who voted against legislation for certain bloodsports, had done so because they saw them as no more cruel than fox or stag hunting. And whereas throwing at cocks was deemed by many in favour of legislation as unmanly and unsporting, fox-hunting had quite the reverse image. Indeed, fox-hunting was still flourishing at the end of the 19th and into the 20th century. Dean Hole of Rochester who had a lot to say on the subject of work and was writing in 1894 also had much to tell us about the merits and demerits of certain bloodsports. He deplored the baiting and fighting of 'worthless bipeds' and that 'all true

gentlemen and sportsmen rejoice in their abolition.' He praised the national influence of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (which in 1840 had become the RSPCA), and launched a long rustic evocation of fox-hunting, singing its praises in lyrical terms as an expression of ENGLAND. He stresses the prayers and the refinement and the fact that huntsmen are not 'mere loafers', generally being able to afford to do it once a week so that 'To the large majority it is their only play-day in the week, and most of them continue some business with their amusement...' In fact, many business deals are transacted 'from the saddle.' Finally fox-hunting is 'the bravest, manliest, healthiest, and most social of all, and ... it is the only one which has not been afflicted by the defilements of the money-grubber, the gambler, and the snob.' (Dean Hole, 1893, p280)

Fox-hunting was thus a sport which survived although as Lowerson and Myerscough describe [1977, pp.116-117] 'not without vicissitudes'. In Sussex, for example, the East Sussex hunt stopped for a while and was refounded in the middle of the century and supported 'through the influence of people who came from the towns. Many were middle class weekenders escaping from the city for a 'bucolic diversion' and they proved a 'vital force for maintaining the older forms of country recreation in Sussex.' Some hunts thrived to such an extent that even at the end of the century they were out five days a week in the season and 'thus those animal sports survived which not only escaped criticism for extreme cruelty, made no disorderly threats to property, but also enjoyed a measure of support from people in the towns.' (Lowerson and Myerscough) Malcolmson also makes the point that 'in almost all cases it was only the distinctly popular pastime that was actually prohibited.' (1973, p122)

Another sport, bull-running, is an example of the high degree of resistance people could muster when their traditional rights were attacked. Malcolmson says this case was similar to other such cases where there was active confrontation when practical measures were used to put down the activity. And sometimes this led to the continuance of a particular sport for some years after. . . . Eventually, however, many of the old customs were abolished with great legal and physical exertion, not to mention class enmity. (For a detailed account of the above see pp. 126-135, Malcolmson, which retells the story of the bull-running of Stamford. Also interesting is the custom of Bishop Blaize of the Bradford Woolsorters and Combers which was used to express contemporary grievances following a strike and which, throughout the 1820's and 30's and into the 40's was 'appropriated in different ways by the different social classes'. pp. 142-3. Also E.P. Thompson, 1963, p. 465).

By the 1830's most of the bloodsports such as cock-fighting in which the upper class men had participated, were predominantly a lower class pastime. Opposition came from various groups - religious, humanitarian, middle class or all three consolidated. The SPCA was strengthened and there was an act of 1835 against cruelty towards animals (which did not apply to rabbits, deer or foxes). By the 1840's, cock-fighting, and bear and bull-baiting had been virtually eliminated. Cock-fighting had taken repeated attempts to stamp out and only succumbed because persecution had hidden it away from the community, and small group activities were more vulnerable to attack.³

It was not bloodsports as such, but *certain* bloodsports that attracted criticism and attack and there was a comparable situation in the case of fairs and wakes (feasts). Fox-hunting could have important

economic convenience for the carrying out of business and was and is often justified by its usefulness to the farmer. With fairs it was those with a diminishing trade importance that came under the most vitriolic assault and repression. The improvement of transport systems, whereby shopkeepers could maintain stocks more regularly, contributed to the lessening of trading functions.[Ian Starsmore, 1975, p. 16] The hiring fairs (labour exchanges) were still fairly well supported into the 1850's when their lessening relevance opened them to attack. (Much of the criticism centred on sexual license and debauchery, see Malcolmson 1973p 77-9). Also, the traditional holiday calendar is an example of selective repression and was not under systematic attack. The main targets were those where the main motive was pleasure.[See Malcolmson, 1973, . Dates which were part of the established institutions were not suffering to the same degree, for example Christmas, Easter, Whitsun.]

Fairs and Wakes

In general, when a fair could no longer be justified in terms of middle class rationality and morality, then it suffered systematic attack. This was often tinged with fears concerning uncontrollability and the crowds attending fairs in post-Napoleonic times had potential as a 'general rendezvous for sedition and the signal for insurrection.'[E.P. Thompson 1963, p. 445. Taken from Sherwin's *Weekly Political Register* 15th September 1817]

Objections to wakes ran along the same lines; they went on for much too long, they were accompanied by unruly sports like wrestling and were

often associated and promoted by publicans which led to intemperance. Moreover, the lower classes should not spend their money on pleasure and the mutual hospitality of wakes led to improvidence, in itself seen as a cause for unrest.

John Ward [1843] described some of the wakes in the Potteries. The one in Tunstall was "like other similar carnivals, generally attended with drunkenness and disorder of several days continuance." [Ward, 1843, p108] The celebration in Burslem, notes Ward, had less vulgar scenes than before and this was because bull-baiting had been prohibited. Ward thought wakes were "poor expedients for allaying the cravings of young persons for occasional amusement..." (p269) and that they were invitations to licentiousness and excess. He believed that:

The man who should succeed in introducing some wholesome and innocent recreation to gratify the natural passion of youth for liveliness and joy, divested of these gross and immoral results which wakes and fairs, and their concomitant exhibitions produce, would entitle himself to the honour of being enrolled amongst the real benefactors of mankind. (Ward, 1843, p269)

Samuel Bamford, however, gave a different picture. He set out to describe the pastimes which were popular in his youth, which had died out and were therefore unknown to "the youthful population of the manufacturing districts of the present day." [S, Bamford] This comparison, he said, would enable us:

... distinctly to perceive the great change which, in a few years, has taken place in the tastes and habits of the working classes ... And ... we shall be better able to determine whether or not the labouring classes have been advancing in, or retrograding from, the state of mind and that bodily habit, which are meant by the term Civilisation, [Bamford, 1893, p119]

His descriptions of the family weaving together and preparing for Christmas suggest he does *not* feel that the labouring classes have

progressed in being civilised in his terms. Wakes are not seen as debauched orgies, but more as colourful, vigorous and healthy fun, so that what he describes, contrasts with commentators such as Ward. This contrast is also a contrast of views of progress and moralities based on views of political economy.[see ch 3] And, apart from the waste of time and money, wakes generally began on a Sunday. Wakes offended the religious feelings of some fellow villagers in some cases. Malcolmson cites the case of one village in Lincolnshire where the inhabitants announced in the local paper their discontent with the customary feasts for reasons of immorality and improvidence. . . Sustained and organised attacks on fairs had begun in the 18th century and rested on the same objections voiced about wakes. For example, between 1761-2, the Essex Quarter Sessions prohibited at least 24 fairs' . . . And in the 17th and 18th centuries, with the growing pleasure side to St. Bartholomew's fair, there were many attempts to suppress its stage plays and puppet shows. It had been very important, from as early as the 12th century, for its cloth trade, but as this function lessened, there were early attempts to limit the days of the fair from fourteen to three. Some of the booths presented satires and comedies which the authorities feared might influence the masses and this added weight to the attacks.(Starsmore 1975,p13)

With regard to the 19th century, one historian recognises three phases in the repression of fairs.[Hugh Cunningham, *The Metropolitan Fairs: A Case Study in the Social Control of Leisure*, in Donajgrodzki, 1977, pp.163-184]. The first, in the early years of the century, is characterised by a fear of popular unrest, which led to a tentative approach in the interference with popular pleasures. It was feared that if

activities were forced by compulsory measures to be abolished, that this would create the unrest that was a threat in the first instance and because it was realised that 'It is at all times difficult by law to put down the ancient customs and practices of the multitude ... '[Taken from Charles Pearson, City Solicitors report of 1840].

The abolition of St. Bartholomew's fair, to which the above quote refers, was achieved by gradual stangulation through the limiting of booths and days and the raising of rents. Of course, out and out attacks were used at other fairs, especially after the passing of the 1822 Metropolitan Police Act, which limited the hours of fairs and provided the machinery for the suppression of unchartered fairs in London. (If the owner or occupier of a fair, summoned by two magistrates, could not produce a title, the fair was pronounced illegal.) In London, many important fairs were abolished, but many survived until the mid-century, for example, Camberwell - (closed in 1850). Sometimes, when new fairs were introduced, they did not at once prove to be very popular. Ward describes how, when a new Burslem Market was opened in 1836, the Market Trustees appointed six new annual fairs. These were to be" holden on the Saturdays preceding Shrovetide, Easter and Whitsuntide, and next after Midsummer-day ... but have been hitherto little regarded."(Ward, 1843, p258)

The second phase Cunningham recognises, was one which saw the rapid decline of fairs in the 1850's and the third, one of eventual tolerance. There was, in the London fairs at least, a partial revival of fairs in the two decades after the attacks of the 1820's. Cunningham even finds evidence to suggest that some fairs enjoyed police confidence in the 1830's, which he sees as a police confidence in the ability they possessed to control big, popular festivals. In 1838, the government

went as far as to give permission for a fair to be held in Hyde Park to mark the coronation of Queen Victoria in which the showmen cooperated with the police and still had a financial success. And in 1850 it was suggested that a fair be held at the same time as the Great Exhibition, in order to draw those who may not find the exhibition suitable (or vice versa?) away from the environs of Hyde Park. See also T. Frost *The Old Showmen and the Old London Fairs*, London, New Edition, 1881 pp.326-9 and cited by Cunningham. Thus it can be said, that 'Far from being a threat to public order, fairs were now being presented as an aid to it.' The Exhibition, however, proved a bigger attraction than the 'class of Entertainment found to be most attractive to them.' [Cited in Nelson Lee and John Johnson, two showmen who cooperated with the police in both the 1838 and the 1851 fairs in Hyde Park, 45/OS 3291 - 'Them', refers to the lower classes.]

The 1850's, however, saw renewed attacks on fairs which was a time of financial weakness for them, when permanent urban entertainments were competing for the market and the circus was expanding. Semi-rural fairs did attract people from the towns especially when the railway could provide the means to a day out. And this prompted attacks from 'respectable inhabitants' and the law. There was a private members' bill of 1871 which facilitated the abolishing of fairs and was used against many in the South East of England. On the occasion of the closing of the fair at Charlton in 1872 one fair-goer complained of there being one law for the rich and another for the poor saying that the disturbance to Charlton was no greater than that of the people in Epsom on Derby Day but that that was not abolished. There was a petition supporting the fair but the police and justices concerned with the 'respectable' complaints

criticised it on the grounds that there were no signatures from people of position.. One Metropolitan fair, Barnet, survived and this is attributed by Cunningham to its enduring importance as a cattle fair and its being so deep rooted in the traditions of the North and East London working class. The police supported its continuance pointing to its orderliness, sources of enjoyment and local profit. Similarly, with the fair at Pinner which received police support when there were attempts by the vicar, magistrates and various inhabitants to abolish it in 1894. More and more the police showed themselves concerned with the 'enjoyment of the poorer classes of the community.. And Cunningham quotes the Home Secretary in 1880, Harcourt, who said that it was wrong to discriminate against fairs because they troubled the police and were seen as having no economic justification. They were valid as the 'popular amusement of the people'. . . (from Sir E. Troup, *The Home Office*, London, 1925 pp. 209-10 , Cunningham, Donajgrodzki, 1977, p178)

One of the reasons that fairs did not die out altogether was the introduction of innovations in the mechanisations of rides and the continuation of many rural fairs. It was true that fairs were seen generally as an urban 'problem' and that it was mainly the London fairs which suffered the weight of the suppression.

One factor in this, according to Malcolmson, was the greater tolerance of rural diversions than city diversions which is connected with the country-Toryism associated with traditions rather than moral improvement.[Malcolmson, 1973, pp.160-2] Another reason put forward to account for the survival of the fair is the fact that people still continued to look for entertainments in their localities.[Cunningham, in Donajgrodzki, 1977, p.179] Further, Cunningham explains that the eventual

tolerance cannot be attributed to the existence of the 'leniency' of the police and government:

Equally important was a change in the values and norms of showmen, who from the middle of the century became respectable and wealthy entrepreneurs of leisure, patronised by Royalty. As a result the police, instead of acting instinctively to suppress fairs, began to cooperate with the showmen in organising them. The visitors to the fairs too, changed their habits. In the first half of the 19th century the fair could be seen as social control in the form of a necessary release from work for the people ... By the end of the century, in contrast, fair-going had become a relatively routine ingredient in an accepted world of leisure. Thus, by a tightening up in the forces of law and order and by a convergence of norms between showmen and fair-goers on the one hand and authority on the other, fairs became tolerated, safe and in due course a subject for nostalgia and revival. (Cunningham, Donajrodzki, 1977, p164)

The growth in urban commercial entertainment paralleled this decline in middle class fears of mob violence and revolution. Music hall audiences, for example, had proved fairly well behaved (if sometimes uncouth) and the working classes were proving that they wanted and could manage their own amusements so that 'The heavy hand of patronage could be removed not only because it was unsuccessful, but also because it was unnecessary.' [p. 179] And commercial entertainments were becoming respectable and providing what was seen as a valuable service. Escott saw the railway as one of the main destroyers of "the great rural festival." He said that many who were just middle aged in the 1880's could remember village feasts with their substantial dinners, the brass band and games:

But as soon as a neighbourhood became accustomed to the snorting and puffing of the steam engine, its old men and women, its young men and maids, took advantage of it ... they were ... put upon the fidget, and the dividends of railway companies rose in proportion. Just as it was the Exhibition of 1851 from which must be dated the first great steps towards improvement made by English people in art and decorative design, so may the opening of the Crystal Palace at Sydenham be identified with a new departure in the region of popular amusement. The Crystal Palace is ... the rendezvous for country parties which

come from all quarters within a radius of 50 or 60 miles from London, [Escott, 1885, p537)

Again Cunningham gives a description of the new fairs which could also be applied to the great urban development - the music hall:

To attract the people, the showmen had to provide an entertainment which gave an appearance of colour, speed, of escape - and this he did in a skillful amalgam of tradition and innovation. But it was an entertainment which was highly organised, which had to be paid for, and in which the experience of freedom contained a large measure of fantasy. There was nothing in any of this to frighten an authority which accepted leisure as an integral part of urban life. Only puritans and rate payers continued to object ...

[Donajgrodzki, 1977, p180)

Urban commerce was also changing the environment of the city giving it too 'the appearance of colour.' So, while technological advances were transforming the space under the pavements in the shape of sewers and drains, (which 'could become symbols of pride as potent as town halls', Asa Briggs, 1968, p. 2), the streets were also attesting to commercial ingenuity and diversity. Briggs describes the scene 'High and low on every available wall advertisements clamoured to the eye: theatres, journals, soaps, medicines, concerts, furniture, wines, prayer meetings - all the produce and refuse of civilisation.' A lawyer wrote in 1851 that there was being created a 'generalised culture' which 'has spread itself and smoothed down all sharp individual traits.' [Johnstone, 1851, p217)

The lure of the towns was seen by Engels as undesirable, not only because of the physical discomfort for the worker, but because of the opportunities they offered for vice and self-seeking individualism. One 19th century commentator lists the attractions of the town for those who live in the country:

The contagion of numbers, the sense of something going on, the theatres and the music halls, the brightly lighted streets and the busy crowds - all, in short, that makes the difference between the Mile End Fair on a Saturday night and a dark muddy country lane, with no glimmer of gas and nothing to do. Who could wonder that men are drawn into such a vortex, even were the penalty heavier than it is?
[Asa Briggs, 1968, p. 6]

Indeed, the census of 1851 showed that since the beginning of the century the population of many towns had quadrupled and more and that in most large towns the migrant population outnumbered the indigenous.[See Hammonds, 1945, p. 24 for approximate figures] This trend was still apparent at the end of the century. In *The Rural Exodus* [1892, Quoted by D.F. Cheshire, 1974, p. 36] P. Anderson Graham claimed that music halls were among the causes of this 'social problem'. The cheap rail excursions had changed the topics of conversation from turnips to the latest trip to town, music hall artistes and actresses. And by the middle of the century commercial interests were turning shops, gin palaces and music halls into opulent attractions, with the use of bright lighting, brass, plate glass and tiling. Though less opulent, the localities also had their share of the attractions and plenty of street life:

The London-road (Manchester) on Saturday night, has very much the appearance of Tottenham-court-road, in the metropolis; ... it is full of cheap shops, devoted to the sale of ordinary household matters ... The gin shops are in full feather - their swinging doors never hang a moment still. Itinerant bands blow and bang their loudest; organ boys grind monotonously; ballad singers or flying stationers make roaring proclamation of their wares ...
A bright lamp over an open door points out the entrance to lovers of harmony and beer,
[Cheshire, from *Labour and the Poor; the Manufacturing Districts...*, Letter VII probably by Henry Mayhew in the *Morning Chronicle* 8th Nov., 1849]

Before we look at music halls, let us first turn to pubs and drink.

Pubs and Drink

Although there had been inns and taverns throughout Britain for many centuries, the public house was a 19th century phenomenon. In the 18th century the inn and ale house provided a public drinking place for casual and festive or sporting occasions as did the home, where home brews were drunk.[Lowerson and Myerscough. 59] One writer, Michael Jackson, defines a pub as a drinking place where no admission fee is charged, but the term 'public house' was not widely used until the 19th century. In the previous century, pubs looked like private houses, being domestic in style and could often only be distinguished from their neighbours by the sign board advertising refreshments.

The early 19th century tavern generally had 5 rooms; the bar and tap rooms, which tended to have fixed benches and wooden tables around the walls and a large open fireplace, the public parlour, which was more genteel, with paintings on the walls and softer furnishings, the kitchen, where in the older country taverns the working men were served and the private parlour of the publican. There were also coffee rooms in the superior taverns for middle class patrons.

At the same time the cities provided dram shops which were take-away or stand-up drink shops, elements of which survive in pubs today. Drinks began to be served from behind counters rather than from the cellar and the bottles placed within easy reach of the bartenders. As early as 1810, mechanical apparatus for the serving of drinks was introduced. The idea of using a counter, as in a shop, eroded the concept of the tavern as a house [Mark Girouard, 1975, p. 28] and the consciousness of a commercial transaction was heightened. And yet, the

fact that men could walk into a pub from the street and sit alone or with others in a convivial atmosphere, and in surroundings like or much more comfortable than home, lent the pub a special aura of a home from home; a *Public* House. Whereas home was the ideal recreational centre of the middle classes, for the working classes, it was nearly as unhealthy as the place where they spent their working day. Often, reformers blamed working class women, many of whom themselves worked, for the problem of intemperance because they did not, they said, make the home attractive enough to keep the husband away from the pub.

The wives and daughters of working men should be taught how to boil and fry, and make the best of their food, If a wife will give her husband a good supper in a clean house, and fill his pipe, as he sits down by the fireside in a comfortable chair after it, she will do much in directing him where to find the truest happiness - at home,
[Dean Hole, 1893, p93)

(There were women's rooms in pubs later on and women did use gin palaces but generally any woman who did drink bought it to take home.) On this subject, Bailey quotes from one working class man from Yorkshire of the 1830's who said, 'There were only two places to go in spending time away from one's own house - church, chapel or alehouse; the former were seldom open, while the latter were seldom closed. The first was not attractive, the second was made attractive.' [Bailey, 1978, p. 9, from J. Lawson 'Letters to the Young on the Progress in Pudsey', Stanningglen, 1887, p. 58]

In 1830 the government passed an act facilitating the sale of beer as a more wholesome drink than spirits, and in the following six years over 46,000 beer houses opened. Charles Shaw linked the beershop to violence and dog-fighting [Shaw, 1983, p32] and saw legislation to encourage

beer-drinking as misguided. He could remember how beer houses sprang up around his home. He said:

If a man could get a barrel of beer into his little coal cellar, he became a seller ... I frequently saw and heard the contrivances and purposes of certain men discussed, by which they might become beer sellers.

(Shaw, 1983, 130)

For Shaw, this attempt to earn money was understandable, but it meant taking money from neighbours and he blamed those above who should spread better influences. Ward described the beershops of Tunstall and Burslem and they outnumbered inns and pubs. Tunstall had "six licensed Ale-houses (including three respectable Innes) and two liquor-shops; but fifty Retail Beer-houses ..." [Ward, 1843, p.108] and these tempt the poor man who should spend his money on necessities. Burslem had 38 inns and pubs, but ninety beer houses and he notes how it outrages codes of moral behaviour, but is to the "benefit of the revenue and the glory of our free-trade economy." ... Intemperance was worse, thought Ward, when there was greater prosperity for then, "a recklessness of the future generally manifests itself." He told of a workman who had died aged 53. He earned three pounds a week and could have saved a thousand if sober, but he died of disease in a workhouse. Like Shaw, Ward regrets the legislation allowing beer shops which had led to crime and counteracted "the educational efforts of the philanthropists". He notes how some "obscure houses" have the sign "Licensed to be drunk on the Premises" which he fears "is interpreted as a legislative invitation to free indulgence".

Most of the historians writing about pubs (Girouard, Bailey, Brian Spiller and Michael Jackson ...) agree that it was the competition this created that prompted the gin trade to react by setting up gin palaces.

What was a gin palace?

In all those parts of Leeds or Manchester, and of London too, where the poorest people live, there you find in almost every dirty street, not one but several fine houses, handsomely stuccoed, curiously painted, ornamented with plate glass and polished brass ... [and] inside, great barrels of spirits gaily painted and disposed for show, carved mahogany and more polished brass, with men and women, smartly dressed, smiling welcome to all who enter.
[Spiller, 1972, pp. 8-9, from Edward Gibbon, *England and America* Wakefield, 1833]

The gin palace was the commercial reaction to a political move, or as Spiller simply states, nearly every significant change in the drink industry can be traced to an act of parliament. The need to legislate, however, was part of the growing middle class awareness of the habits of the working class and the figures that testify to the increase in gin consumption, between 1811 and 1827, matched the increase in crime figures. (Girouard, 1975, p.23, explains that the number of convictions was probably due to increased police activity and efficiency). Gin, as part of a commercial enterprise could not be outlawed, but legislation could be used to coerce and change habits in favour of beer. Gin palaces, however, also sold beer and wines and were shops as much as places in which to spend time. They were, in reality, 'gin shops in the new flamboyant style'. [Girouard 1975 p 25] They were potent opposition to the beer shop and a contemporary description of the opening of a gin palace tells of the gimmicky transformation of an older style pub, giving a vivid impression of the scale of the change and the energy involved:

A public house nearly opposite to my residence, where the consumption of spirits was very trifling, was taken for a gin palace, it was converted into the very opposite of what it had been, a low dirty public house, with only one doorway, into a splendid edifice, the front ornamented with pilaster, supporting a handsome cornice and entablature, and balustrades, and the whole elevation remarkably striking and handsome; the doorways were increased in number from one,

and that a small one only three or four feet wide, to three, and each of those three eight to ten feet wide; the floor was sunk so as to be level with the street; and the doors and windows glazed with very large single squares of plate glass, and the gas fittings of the most costly description; ... When this edifice was completed, notice was given by placards taken round the parish by a number of men, that it would be opened on Saturday evening at six-o'clock; a band of music was stationed in front of the house; the street became almost impassable from the number of people collected; and when the doors were opened, the rush was tremendous; it was instantly filled with customers, and continued so till midnight.

[Girouard, p. 25. from evidence given before a select committee 'On the Prevailing Vice of Drunkenness', in 1834, by Mr. George Wilson, a grocer of Tothill St, Westminster.]

It is obvious from the above description, that the architecture and decor were very important, indeed vital, to accommodate and attract large numbers. One writer believes that 'the gin palaces of the 1830's exercise their potent spell through the brilliant illumination of large areas of plate glass.' [Spiller, 1972, p.74] Mirrors and glass gave an impression of greater spaciousness and attractively displayed and reflected the wares. (Later this included embossed and engraved glass and mirrors which characterises late Victorian pubs. Open spaces were favoured by many gin palaces, because it was easier to serve when crowded and did not encourage people to linger overlong at their drink. The question of space in drinking places worried magistrates who felt that the breaking up of space especially in pubs, made supervision difficult and encouraged crime. See Spiller, 1972, pp.68-9)

Temperance reformers had thought of turning this aspect of the decor to their advantage by trying to ensure that the front of pubs contained so much plate glass that the drinker, being visible, would moderate his habits. [Bailey, 1977, p.98 & n. 40, p. 206] This was also recommended for beer-shops which had to have glass in the door and windows within three feet of the ground. The idea was to have a view of

all that was happening inside.[See Parliamentary Papers 1837, p. 61] However, temperance energy concentrated on the creation of alternatives to the pub which were modelled *on* the pub (for example coffee pubs. see Girouard, 1975, p. 21). The later Victorian pub itself continued in the richness of design and polished brass and wood which, as Spiller says, contributed to the effect of cosy intimacy 'to give a sense of plenty and well-being.'[Girouard, p. 68. quoted from J.M. Richards *Pub at Peckham Rye* in *Architect's Journal* 30th May, 1957]

Another feature of the gin palace was the use of swing doors which were silent and smooth for easy access and in the rougher districts made it easier to eject troublemakers.[Bailey comments on the passing of the domesticity of the pub into the 'commercialised glamour' of the gin palaces which were 'gaudy compensations for the meanness of everyday life'.[Bailey, 1978, p. 16] He quotes Dickens who said that gin palaces were 'invariably numerous and splendid in precise proportion to the dirt and poverty of the surrounding neighbourhood'.[Dickens, *Sketches by Boz*, Vol I pp. 314-330]

Marx explained why this business enterprise was so profitable; how it was a characteristic of class relations, helped to maintain them, and speculated money on refined needs which it both created and satisfied. Gin shops testify to the ingenuity of 'Industrial luxury and wealth' which for the many may not be owned but only touched briefly for the price of a drink. Catering for the crude needs of the worker and his 'self-stupefaction' and their own profits, 'The English gin-shops are therefore the *symbolic* representation of private property. Their *luxury* demonstrates to man the true relations of industrial luxury and wealth. For that reason they are rightly the only Sunday enjoyment of the English

people, and are at least treated mildly by the English police.'[Marx, 1975, pp. 363-4]

Much more than simply a place to drink the pub also housed numerous other activities which were criticised by temperance reformers for the fact that they had pub connections. As one 20th century writer describes it, the pub of the 19th century was 'an all purpose service institution in working class life (publicans provided much more than mere drink: house of call, toilet facilities, a treasury for sick clubs, refuge from the wet and from the wife, dominoes and cards, reading matter, food and music); but to the middle classes all this appeared quite frightening.'[Storch, in Donajgrodzki, 1977, p.145]

Indeed the pub was also the venue for other activities, including auctions, sport, inquests, betting and lodgings. Some pubs, which included the latter service, changed their name to hotel in the mid-century to sound more respectable.[Spiller, 1972, p.18] Some of these functions left the pub as the century progressed [Jackson, '76p24]; one pub had even been a prison until 1810.'

In his *The Shows of London* [1978], R.D. Altick, gives many examples of pub diversions and entertainments including animal acts, in the 1820's and 30's ('involving easily portable exhibits of the sort that formerly occupied booths at the now declining fairs...' p. 307)- therefore the fate of the fairs affected other entertainments and an 18th century example of the exhibiting of American Indians. Further, evidence is given of 18th century pubs having museums although no record exists of them until the 19th century. The exhibits which were often historical and from natural science were generally accrued rather than thematically arranged and collected. One pub, the Star in Bolton, expanded its

recreational side from singing to include a picture gallery, museum and menagerie.[Bailey, 1978, p. 311]

As for the temperance movement, which we discuss in the next section, the pub practice most despised was the giving out of wages there. D'Eichthal, a French visitor in 1928, met Francis Place who told him that this method of payment saved the bosses a 7% bank charge payable for the changing of notes into silver. However, although 'the publican alone was in possession of small change mine host used to insist on every transaction that each worker should buy a pint of beer. After the first a second would follow, and so on until the majority of the workers would get drunk ...'[D'Eichthal, 1977, p.47]

Pubs were also used at one time for trade union meetings, but by the 1890's this practice was declining.[Girouard, 1975, p.15] Pubs were also traditional canvassing and election centres. In *Felix Holt*, George Eliot describes how working class support was drummed up in pubs using drink even at a time when they did not have a vote. Likewise, Felix Holt, who deplores this buying of political loyalty and rabble-rousing says, 'I go for educating the non-electors, so I put myself in the way of my pupils - my academy is the beer house.'¹⁹⁷⁸[p. 89] George Eliot is describing through her character an unusual view of the methods of reform. Both working class radicals and middle class reformers were interested in setting up alternatives to counter the attractions of drink for example. However, Eliot is not just expressing the hope, through the character of Felix, in the rationality and redemption of the working classes, but also a faith in the power of personal contact to effect changes. This is one of the threads running through reform ideas from Colquhoun to Chadwick and others after them.

Temperance

Dean Hole wrote in 1893 that the fight against drunkenness united all temperance advocates no matter how they differed in their views on how to stamp it out. (See p87) The concern of the upper and middle class temperance fighters was also shared by those interested in working class emancipation including Marx, Engels, Lovett and also some women's temperance groups, but different motives existed which meant their aims could ultimately be very much at variance as could the methods of operation and proposed remedies.

Just as we saw earlier on, the reasons and remedies concerning self help which were propounded by all political viewpoints, often appeared to coincide, albeit from different sides of the fence. This coincidence is, however, superficial in many ways and even though it may be argued that ultimately it all benefits the prevailing system the need of the working class to ameliorate their conditions in 'on the spot' circumstances must not be forgotten or underestimated. (Hearn tends to this view to the extent that it seems that he feels the working class have let him down badly). The reasons propounded for intemperance do not clarify the matter, as all types of people could conclude sympathetically on the lack of other recreational opportunities, nagging wives, thirst from hard work ... A brief examination of the different strands will perhaps help to explain the positions.

D'Eichthal travelled to Lancashire during his 1828 visit and while he wrote that he thought there were few respectable men in the lowest paid class, he also said, 'in all probability drink is a necessity for the spinners, it is the only thing that keeps them going.' [p. 93] And Engels

connected drink with the working and living conditions of the working class:

Liquor is almost their only source of pleasure, and all things conspire to make it accessible to them. The working man comes home from his work tired, exhausted, finds his home comfortless, dirty, damp, repulsive; he has urgent need of recreation, [1969, p. 133]

Fourteen years later, a writer described the cotton famine and the way the spinners bore it "with a high tone of moral dignity, a marked sense of propriety, a decency, cleanliness, and order ... which do not merit the intense suffering I have witnessed. I was beholding the gradual immolation of the noblest and most valuable population..."[E.P. Thompson, 1963, p. 463, from *Notes on a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire 1842* by Cooke Taylor, pp. 37-9] The 'uncertainty of his existence' coupled with his bad conditions 'demand some external stimulus.' The pub is the only place he can meet his friends and so, morally and physically, he cannot resist the temptation to drink. Drink is not, however, an individual, immoral vice and the responsibility for drunkenness lies ultimately at the door of those who create the conditions in which it thrives. Engels, 1969, blames the 1830 Beer Act for the almost quadrupling of beer consumption between 1823 and 1837 and also, in passing, the service of the pawnbroker. He adds, that on Saturdays, 'I have rarely come out of Manchester on such an evening without meeting numbers of people staggering and seeing others lying in the gutter.' [p. 157] (Girouard makes the point that hungry people get drunk very quickly - see p. 31 re., gin shops: "Their customers tended to get drunk because semi-starving people get drunk very easily. It was not a pretty system but it was as much due to the society that had notoriously failed to

house or feed a vast new immigrated population as to the publicans who at least gave their customers warmth and some form of glamour as an escape from the squalor in which they lived.") And those who take the pledge break it under the above pressures. Further, to give up drink 'meant complete social isolation. It could mean losing your job ...'[Angela Sebestyn, 1980, pp. 22-71]

Giving up drinking sometimes led to persecution from your fellow workers; there were cases of people having their effigy burnt on the doorstep (and see also Donajgrodzki, 1977, Storch essay, p. 154). In one case a Leeds man who had to pay a shop fine and who had taken the pledge was asked by his workmates to pay it by spending it on drink and although he asked to pay double rather than comply, he was finally forced to leave the shop.

Apart from the effects of drinking on health and morals, Engels mentions that it led to 'the ruin of all domestic relations' (ibid., p. 157). This was a theme greatly harped on by the middle class reformers. Dean Hole (who believed more in temperance rather than abstinence) exclaimed 'Drunkenness! how it darkens the sunshines of happy homes, estranges man and wife, puts an end to the mutual society, help, and comfort, which the one ought to have of the other ...'[Hole, 1893, p.83]

The women of the temperance movement could not have agreed more. Most of the writers on drink, whether 19th or 20th century, have treated it, for the most part, as a male subject. The 19th century writers who do include women tended to deplore their domestic arrangements which were seen to be their own responsibility. However, in a recent interesting article, 'Women Against the Demon Drink', Amanda Sebestyen traces the history of the involvement of women in the fight for temperance and sees,

within their struggle, many of the aims for Women's Rights. Whereas one 20th century historian describes the temperance movement solely in the terms of middle class reformers thus:

The gulf across which middle class reformers spoke to working class men was wide. They demanded detachment from the real, pulsating life of the community, its trade customs, patterns of conviviality and marriage markets; in short the very stuff of what we call culture, [Storch, in Donajgrodzki, 1977, p154)

The 19th century temperance women, as did the men, saw that pubs were places of retreat from 'the wife'. One woman from the American Women's Temperance Union, Frances Willard, said, 'They tell me that the saloon is the poor man's club. When I hear that, I often say to myself, "What is his wife's club I wonder?"' [Sebestyen, 1980, p.22] Involvement in the temperance movement enabled some women to express their real disgust at male violence and sexual behaviour and Sebestyen believes that the deprecating image of the temperance reformer was in many cases mistaken. Often they were 'the strongest kind of rebel'. Those advocating temperance frequently were:

Nonconformist both in politics and religion (when not actually atheists and socialists), they made close friends with the town drunkards and were often reformed alcoholics themselves. The temperance movement was part of a humanitarian wave opposed to child labour, capital punishment, bloodsports... and for universal suffrage, [Sebestyen, 1980, p23)

Further, women were anxious about the money being spent in the pub which is illustrated by the fact that 'Every payday the pub was besieged by wives desperately anxious to feed and clothe the family.' [From Brian Harrison's *Drink and the Victorians* No page reference given] Commenting on how he thinks wages should be paid at the works and not at the pub,

Shaw wrote that "towards ten-o'clock poor wretched women would appear and entreat their husbands to go home. When this failed, they pleaded for money ..." (Shaw, 1983, p.87) (Those who worked in pubs as barmaids were still working a 90 hour week on very low wages at the end of the 19th century) Of course there were supporters of temperance, women as well as men, whose main aim was the strengthening of religion and the family as well as socialists of both sexes, but as Sebestyen points out 'that's not the whole story'. Towards the end of the century, a period which saw consumption levels of liquor, which was much stronger than it is now, rise to their highest than at any time since, [Girouard, 1975, p.21] the temperance movement was attracting more and more criticism from the left (for example the Social Democratic Federation - Sebestyen, 1980, p.26) and identified with interfering philanthropists. In the early 20th century it became more and more usual for there to be state interference in the liquor industry and hours of pub and club opening were drastically reduced. Sebestyen quotes from *The Communist Manifesto* a short passage which equates 'temperance fanatics' with that part of the bourgeoisie 'desirous of redressing social grievances in order to secure the continued existence of bourgeois society.' [Sebestyen, 1980, p.26]

What Sebestyen is criticising is the use, by those left wing critics of the temperance movement, of 'temperance and feminism as sticks to beat one another' and see them as part of a lunatic fringe or feminine puritanism which seeks to emasculate socialism. Temperance as a wholly middle class religious socially conservative movement is simply not the whole story. And the fact that many historians and contemporary writers of the period do not pay much, if any, attention to the hardships caused to the working class through excessive drinking both to men and women,

they can dismiss the temperance movement as a purely middle class social control agent. An inclusion and consideration of the quality of the lives of women makes it impossible to gloss over the problems caused by drink. And yet, the reactionary part of the movement can not by the same token be ignored. It is not enough to say that drunkenness was not a totally working class phenomenon, but it is important to recognise as with the case of blood sports, the hypocrisy of middle class attempts to civilize. Indeed, we doubt whether left wing writers on the subject with this bias would actually advocate drunkenness, but their emphasis on the class control nature of reform movements (which is quite true) has ignored some of the positive aspects. Lovett himself was as believer in temperance as a prerequisite to working class emancipation and in the power and necessity of the working class to help themselves in this direction. And there were teetotal Chartists, (Shaw, 1983, p.143). R.D. Storch in his essay 'The Problem of Working-Class Leisure' [in ¹⁹⁷⁷ Donajgrodski, pp.138-162] asks why did the bourgeoisie of the mid-century persist in their attempts at moral reform? He believes that it did not continue simply through fear of social disorder especially after the collapse of Chartism. The answer, he suggests, is to be found in the tension set up in the early 19th Century between the social and the moral sides of reform. The former was expressed through the new poor law or the police, and the latter in the 'conventicles of respectability.' (p.155) (Corrigan has a more thorough-going definition of morality. See Chapter 5 above). The tension was between the 'formal mechanisms of manipulation and coercion' and the need to diffuse a set of norms and standards for people which were 'right.' This was seen in Chapter 1 in the different views on social policy; broadly speaking, the tension between

those who believed in coercive police methods, those who believed in moral and cultural reform and those who saw that the latter, expressed through 'conventicles of respectability' were part and parcel of policing and sanitary measures. As Storch says, Chadwick, for example, was one of the latter.

Shaw reveals a nostalgia for the past, when towns were surrounded by country lanes and there were less chances for intemperance. He reasons that social conditions were worse then and therefore "Many evils suffered now are self inflicted".[Shaw, 1983, p.45] Ward, however, goes further back, to the 18th century and describes what Elias would call the civilising process.[See ch 3.] The worthies of Hanley and Shelton were, he says, "homely, hearty and convivial men." [Ward, p. 368] They decided to have annual civic dinners and these were mock Mayor's feasts for which the Marquess of Stafford gave them half a buck. The first was in 1783 and the test of admission was to drink a "yard-length-glass of ale at a single draught." He goes on to describe the subsequent changes:

But the prevalent practices and opinions of the period when such things took place were utterly at variance with those which now prevail among the upper and middle ranks of society, and so little was then thought of the virtue of temperance that anyone who should have propounded a scheme for establishing uniform sobriety, much more total abstinence from intoxicating liquors would have been laughed at as an idiot, or scouted as an enemy to all good fellowship and generous hospitality ... the progress of improvement among the higher orders of society in the potteries is, indeed, in no respect more conspicuous than in the decline of the debasing and brutalising practice of hard drinking which within the last 50 years and less, was so prevalent that the master of the house in entertaining his friends thought it a proof of niggardliness, and a gross breach of hospitality, if he neglected to ply them with bumpers until they were reduced below the level of consciousness and rational beings, Such were the scenes ... at the house of feasting, and ... at the house of mourning, that is to say, at funerals ...

Good example should come from the socially superior, therefore, Ward forbears to tell any stories in the fear they could be "a sanction to the inferior classes of the community ..." Ward admits that previously there were some respectable amusements, (for example bowling) and that later, vicious ones (for example horse racing) emerged. He believes, however, that many others have taken to beautifying their houses and grounds, patronising the fine arts and "in promoting a higher degree of moral and intellectual attainment among the operative classes, by establishing and encouraging religious societies on various models, schools for educating the young, and mechanic's institutes for employing the leisure hours of those of riper years." [p. 269] There developed a firm confidence in the idea that a character change was necessary in the working class and that it was through this that the desired qualities of thrift, respectability, temperance etc., was truly achieved. Another obvious reason that the middle class missionising continued was that the working classes were needed and indeed vital to the maintenance of that class and society (this tacit recognition is a turning on its head of the usual middle class dictum which said that it was the working class that profited from middle class profits and interest. And 'what is in the interest of society is in their own also.' Storch, in Donajgrodzki, 1977, p.157, from Jos. Kay *Social Conditions and Education* 1, p. 581) Temperance, characterised as middle class missionising, while true, is an inadequate picture. There was a vested interest in the moral and cultural reform of the working classes and drink was an obstacle to reasonableness seen as necessary to attain that end, but it was also a problem to the working classes themselves. (Of course, not all working class people were roaring drunks and could be drinkers *and* for working class improvement. Peter Bailey, [1978, p.90-11,

includes an account of a piece written by Thomas Wright in A. Halliday Ed., *The Savage Club Papers*, 1868, pp.214-30, in which he tells of a working class man called Bill Banks and his wife and friends who use a St. Monday to see Hampton Court. They start the day off with a visit to a pub, have ale with their lunch and later the tipsy Bill Banks gets into a scuffle and the day is rounded off with a trip to the Alhambra music hall. He also takes books from the library and goes on 'rational' outings. Thus Bailey makes the point that, seen at different times of the day, Banks could be characterised as either feckless or responsible.)

For Lovett, drink was a problem for the working classes in that it blocked the way to their liberation and that emancipation could be reached by a grouping together of the sober and moral elements in the Working Man's Associations. These would do more in the long term than 'an indiscriminate union of thousands, where the veteran drunkard contaminates by his example.' (Lovett, 1920, p.96) He thought the bourgeoisie, en masse, not so much *against* drink as *for* its uses in making the working classes willing slaves. He thought, along with such writers as Marx and Engels, that one of the main causes of intemperance was the lack of alternative stimulation or 'the absence of that knowledge and mental recreation which all just governments should seek to diffuse ...

The Working Man's Association was set up with the aim of studying that which would help the working class to see its true interests and against those who sought to keep them 'ignorant and divided,' and drink was one way that this division was maintained. Thus the remedies the men of the Working Men's Associations suggested were in the realm of knowledge which they saw as a radical solution. And if the 'teachers of temperance and preachers of morality' would concern

themselves more with the source of the problem 'instead of nibbling at the effects, and seldom speaking of the cause', the problem would be solved. (Lovett. 1920, p99)

In 1829, Lovett presented a petition to Parliament asking for the British Museum and other exhibitions to be opened on Sundays, it 'being the only leisure day for working men,' emphasising that men go to pubs not for the love of drink, but rather for the sociability. Coercive measures and prohibitory laws, he believed, were not the answer, for 'the best remedy for drunkenness at all times, is to divert and inform the mind, and to circulate sound knowledge among the people' and music, museums and public libraries and instructive lectures should be a part of this. He emphasised that in the forty-six years between the petition and the writing of this autobiography, his conviction that there was no better means to remove drunkenness than the Sunday opening of museums, strengthened.

In the decades between 1830-1850, there were various investigations into the anti-democratic management of museums or 'non-commercial institutions' in London, (for example, 1835-6 The British Museum; 1841, 'National Monuments and Works of Art'; 1850, National Gallery - see Altick, 1975, pp. 434-469 Chp. 5 above). The issues involved, proved emotional, and one, the closing of the British Museum at Easter and Whitsun during the inquiry of '35, was defended by the 'crusty principle librarian' Sir Henry Ellis. The reason, that of a general annual cleaning, was questioned because it coincided with the time when certain sections of the people had most leisure to use the facilities.

Evidence was used to suggest that if museums were opened on Sundays they would counteract the effects of the gin palace. The outcome was that

in 1837, the British Museum was opened for the first time during the holiday and on the first Easter Monday, there were over 23,000 visitors. However, despite the fact that there was no breach of the peace as feared by some, many of Ellis' colleagues were still against Sunday opening. Again, giving evidence to the National Monuments Committee in 1841, Ellis showed himself opposed to it because, it emerged, he was a Sabbatarian. Arguments 'for', recognised the need for city dwellers to use its resources when it was inconvenient to go out to the countryside. Ellis, however, shared, with the Duke of Wellington, the belief that museums would not deter the lower classes from the pub and there were some who feared that they would combine the two, despite the evidence of 'good behaviour' at the British Museum. The Duke was Chief Constable of the Tower of London and was afraid that the admittance of working class people would lead to trouble; it could prove the English mob's bastille, especially with all those arms lying around to tempt them. As Altick points out, the notion that the museum was an alternative to the pub, indeed its very mention in combination, worried those in charge as the latter was remembered as mob headquarters and revolutionary meeting places. Those advocating museums conversly saw the museum as a depoliticised leisure space.

In *The Bleak Age* the Hammonds explain, using evidence given before the Committee on Public Houses, 1853, (one of the first official uses of the term 'public house'), how the setting up of a Rational Recreation Association in Leeds, led to a decrease in drunkenness and improved 'manners'[p.129]. Music concerts were given in the Town Hall and the Botanical Gardens opened on Sundays. There was also evidence of the same from Manchester, with its Zoological garadens and Liverpool with its

steamers. The Committee concluded that 'counter-attractions to the public house' were powerful enough to decrease drinking. All that was needed, therefore, was the provision of such facilities.

But what of the attempts of the temperance movement itself at setting up counter-attractions. Bailey says that in the 1840's, the movement was the 'single most important agency of recreational improvement.' [1978, p.47] In the 1840's, for example, Thomas Cook started in the travel world by organising temperance excursions (see also Sebestyen, 1980). And yet there were, as we saw with Lovett, some working class people who viewed the efforts of middle class temperance reformers as an insult. (Some were *not*. In the early 20th Century, when the Salvation Army went to pubs singing, the drunken customers would join in and enjoy it, rather than be insulted.) Moreover, by the end of the century, the grand designs of such efforts were proving difficult to attain. It was becoming:

neither feasible nor possible to entice the masses into respectability the turf of the great industrial city proved too stony. The numerous conventicles set up for the purpose, were usually highly artificial efforts, and often were unable to compete for the free time of the worker with the increasing number of attractions and activities offered by commercial recreational entrepreneurs. A great garden tea party was laid on, but the whole the full complement of guests neglected to arrive. That prong of middle class moral reform which attempted to deal directly with the worker, ran head on into an increasingly 'corporate' working class culture, more impervious to 'domestic missionaries' of all sorts than had originally been expected,

[Storch, in Donajgrodzki, 1977, p.157]

Not only did middle class initiatives have to compete with growing commercial entertainments, but also with the will of many working class people to organise their own recreation and their rejection of patronage. One example of this, described by Bailey and Richard N. Price, is the

Working Men's Club Movement. This will be the topic of the following discussion.

The Working Men's Club Movement

Originally, this was a form of rational recreation fostered by the Working Men's Club and Institute Union (1862), on a nationwide basis. By the '80's, this movement, which owed its initial impetus to the middle class, was exclusively working class and 'the original designs of its mentors had been all but frustrated.'(Bailey,1978, .p106)

Richard N. Price [1971], believes that this change away from 'tea and tract' missionising by many reformers towards a more subtle approach, was a new variation theme, the aims of which were basically remarkably similar to the days of hope in the Mechanics' Institutes, the Temperance Movement etc. Thus, 'the strategy remains the same, only the techniques differ by becoming more sophisticated.'[p.117] According to Price, this shift was also expressed in the greater emphasis in adult education on the arts as opposed to 'raw' knowledge and was a recognition of their civilising and 'refining' effects.

When the Club and Institute Union was formed in 1862, to co-ordinate and supervise the growth of WMC's, the word 'club' and 'institute' had special significance. The former was to express a cosy sociability and the latter to express the serious educational and improving aims. The earliest attempts at opening such clubs for the working class were made in the late 1840's and throughout the '50's by manufacturers and the clergy, and were generally short lived; the most successful were those of

the small towns.[See Price,1971] and Bailey,1978]. The twofold aims of these clubs were refinement and social harmony; alcohol was forbidden and sometimes bible-readings formed a substantial part of the activities.

One example of the new approach of creating a social set-up in working class territory centred on the issue of drink and WMC's. Given the fact that drink was seen as a moral failing by most religious interests, it is remarkable that many of those clergy at the five conferences between 1866-7 were in favour of the inclusion of some beer in the clubs. These men consisted of those who operated at grass- roots level who did not want to see the movement dwindle away. And eventually Henry Solly, a leading energy in the CIU, was convinced partly by the example of those clubs who did sell beer and also because the sale of beer was a counter-attraction to the pub.

Middle class patronage was not abandoned until the 1880's because it was essential financially (Solly had also managed to enlist much aristocratic patronage) and because it controlled the decision making powers both at local and national levels. Undoubtedly, the clubs fulfilled a social need, providing amongst other things, warmth, bar, committee rooms, games and library for the working men, not to mention a need to reform for the middle class. The tension between the two over the patronage of one class by another and lack of democracy, culminated in the club members gradually gaining more and more share in the power of decision making, until in 1884 when they managed to secure club control of the Council or governing body. Without patronage, the clubs proved solvent (one reason for this was the sale of beer) and Price describes it as 'a true working class organisation.' He attributes this to the fact that it was used by predominantly working class men and did not, as did

the Mechanic's Institutes, admit socially aspiring lower middle class members. Its importance lies in its working class character and in the scale of the effort. Escott describes the WMC (1880's), as a "humanising" factor like free libraries. It is, he said, a politically harmless institution and if political ideas are included, they are Conservative or Liberal.' He sees the clubs as practical, and writes about a visit to one "which may be taken as typical of many others." The members are all "bona-fide" workers; some are masters and others are skilled mechanics. Admission is by ballot and bad conduct is punished " - by expulsion - as 'conduct unworthy of a gentleman' would be in one of the co-operative palaces of Pall Mall or St. Jame's Street." During his visit , Escott saw a debating/entertainments hall and a small refreshment room. In daylight, there would be a few members in working dress who had come in to read the newspaper in their lunch break. He could play chess or billiards. Some who go in the day are unemployed or on holiday. The library has works by J.S. Mill, Smiles and Buckle, but not by Carlyle and has portraits of M.P.'s and one of George Washington. In the evening, members come in working dress (tidied up) because they want a change of scene and conversation. If there is to be a discussion, a paper might be read out and debated and sometimes there are lectures. If the topics are sometimes political "it is certainly better that these men should be in their clubs than at taverns or gin shops." [p.543] Escott, 1885, Escott believed that the Clubs did a good educational job and would "render open intoxication a barbarous anachronism." Education had convinced the upper classes of this and it could do the same for the lower classes.

(Numbers of Clubs, [Price, 1971, p124])

1862	CIU formed
1863	23
1873	245
1883	550
1893	421 - By 1900 there were over 1½ million members
1904	1000
1971	4000 - 3½ million members)

The importance of the club also lies in the way it exemplified common features in the thinking of social reformers and their ideas on rational recreation. One of their aims was still to educate the working class, but now the starting point was the 'workingman's' humblest social wants for relaxation and amusement' so that gradually they are taken to 'very respectable heights of knowledge and education ... ' In fact 'You fail if you present the thick end of the plane first.' (Bailey, 1978, p.110. Cited in Solly, *Social Clubs and Institutes* p.57)

Education in this broad sense, was to come from the meetings of the different social classes in an informal atmosphere and from the occasional lectures (never very successful). The Club was intended as a sort of neutral ground (Price, p.140), to foster class harmony to ensure that the working class was sensible to the fact that the prevailing system of government and economy was in the best interests of *both* capital and labour. Education could be used therefore, to engender all sorts of good things that would have an impact on industrial affairs. (In fact, in London 1859, during the builder's strike, working men's institutes were used by bosses as an alternative to pubs and as a place of amusement for non-unionised labour - Bailey, 1978, p.116). Price also

quotes Solly on the subject (and it has relevance to the efforts of James Hole and the adult education movement that we discussed in the previous chapter.) 'Every one of the problems that now harass and sometimes half-madden capitalists and workmen in their relations to one another, I really believe, depend for a satisfactory, perhaps for a peaceful solution, on the increase of education among our adult artisans.' [From Solly Collection, Vol. 2. pp.42-47]. The WMC's, initially part of middle class patronage, were thus related to the other educational schemes. Music was another area used within the rational recreation field (see Reginald Nettel, *North Staffordshire Music - A Social Experiment*. Wales 1977. E.D. Mackerness, *A Social History of English Music*. London 1964, Chapters 4 and 5. Edward Lee, *Music of the People*, A study of popular music in Great Britain, London 1970, Chapters 4 and 5. Ronald Pearsall, *Victorian Popular Music*, 1973, Chapter 7.) The music hall, by comparison, may appear to have been, as a commercial venture, autonomous from the developments in rational recreation. While it is true that the profit motive (in financial terms) separates it from the rational recreation facet of attempts to civilise, it had, in some cases, much in common with rational recreation. As we shall see in the next section, it was made by those 'up-market' music hall owners to respond to the middle class morality which animated it.

The Music Halls

Some middle class commentators saw the music hall as uncultured rubbish; evidence of the brute nature of the lower classes and some

working class opinion believed it to be a subtle form of social control. The controversies surrounding the halls, however, often involved those who were active in rational recreation schemes and generally centred around two issues, drink and sex. There were some individual cases of middle class reforming support for the music hall and some even had the idea of it as of benefit to the working class if the middle class were to also frequent the music hall. Thus the early century idea of paternalistic social control through class contact continued to be taken up by those who determined to help the working class through moral transformation to the ultimate goal of self help. Lovett writes of how the Chartist Hall in Holborn was repeatedly refused a licence for music and dancing and the publican who evicted him opened Weston's Music Hall on the premises with no trouble over obtaining the necessary licence. He thought this was an example of the fear of working class political unrest and the promotion of alternatives to that. It was also a commercial venture which in itself was seen as a laudable affair.

Bailey describes how the Victorians believed music to be 'the least corruptible and most civilising of all arts.' Cooke-Taylor commented in 1842 that the operatives in Manchester who frequented the concert rooms of pubs were well behaved and decorous, sang 'unobjectionable songs', were temperate and that he had been to pubs which offered no entertainment and the scenes there were indescribable. And another commentator in the Dublin University Magazine in 1874 stated his disappointment that the music halls had not provided 'good music and true art' and:

Literature, which has on the whole done such immense good by becoming cheap and universal, afforded a parallel instance, giving substantial grounds for this hope ... We cannot but lament especially the disappointment of the expectations that were once entertained of the Music Halls as means of elevating recreation for the people,

[Bailey, 1978, p. 160]

Temperance reformers were also dismayed at the apparent identification of commercial drink interests and public entertainment (not to mention the music hall songs about drink). And as with the case of the wakes previously, it was thought that the music hall was a financial extravagance that the working class could not afford. [See J. E. Ritchie *The Night Side of London*, 1857, and *Days and Nights in London*, 1880, who Bailey describes as 'an inveterate music hall hater']

The history of the music hall is in many ways inseparable from the drink issue. Music and drinking in inns, taverns and ale houses, stretches back hundreds of years, as do theatre productions and puppet shows; but it was not until the 19th century that the music hall emerged for in the previous centuries, because although the 'scene was set', 'Patronage was lacking and the age of capitalism had not yet arrived.' [Harold Scott, 1946, p. 9 (For a potted history of early developments for example pleasure gardens and singing saloons, see Cheshire, pp. 11-20)]

In 1843, however, the act was passed which removed the monopoly established in 1737 on the production of drama in Drury Lane and Covent Garden. But if the singing saloons chose to stage drama they could not serve refreshments in the auditorium and if they were served, stage plays could not be produced. Those which chose the latter, went on to develop into the music hall (though many ways were devised to get around the drama ban and there were many legal battles fought over the issue. See S.T. Felstead, 1947, p. 25) A famous example is that of Charles Morton, a licenced victualler who used an annexe for entertainment which proved such a financial success that in 1854 he reconstructed it, at great

expense, to accomodate 1,500. It also included a library, reading room and picture gallery and admission prices started at sixpence. Later, in 1861, Morton opened another music hall, the Oxford, which he had converted from the old posting house called the Boar and Castle in the West End. Moreover, 'This Oxford was a magnificent building seating close on 2,000 people and lit, with gas of course, so brilliantly that the people flocked there to blink and stare with amazement.' [Felstead, 1947, p. 25]

Girouard describes the Oxford as a music hall with a pub slotted into it at ground level and relates how pub architects were often also the architects of music halls, (for example Finch Hill, Paraire, Wylon and Long and William Britton.) The connection continued in the fact that numerous music hall artistes retired as publicans and also that many successful music hall proprietors had started in business as publicans. [Girouard, 1975, p. 20] As time went on, however, music halls became more and more autonomous from pubs; singers were now being paid in cash rather than drink and there was a distinct move within the music hall profession for an emphasis on the entertainment and away from refreshments, (although the importance of the latter in the financial success of the music hall was never forgotten by many of the entrepreneurs.) Indeed, Morton, while at the Canterbury, had allowed women to enter, but when they came in such great numbers that the low admission fee or 'dry money' was not made up in 'wet money' at the bar, he began to use excuses to women who came in order to admit men who would spend more on drink. [Manders and Mitcheson, 1974, p. 22 Also Felstead, 1947, p. 22]

A number of factors contributed to the lessening in importance of drink in the halls. First, the bars were at the side of the auditorium,

providing promenades for drinking and walking about. And then fixed seating gradually replaced tables and chairs, with the bar placed outside the auditorium. The success of these changes and their introduction were prompted by various stringent municipal and local government regulations, (for example 1878 Metropolitan Board of Works Act in London, plus other areas' regulations which virtually led to the redevelopment of the music hall, see Cheshire, 1974, p. 33) and the ability of a few top music hall entrepreneurs to afford the alterations, the need for which meant the closure of numerous of the smaller local halls. In the last few decades of the century, music hall was more and more in the hands of big combines and syndicates and becoming plushier. As the music hall had its connections with the drink business, so it was appropriated by the anti-drink campaigners so that, as with the WMC's, the Coffee Music Hall Co. founded in London in 1880, attempted to reach working class people through primarily social means.[See Bailey, 1978, p.162] This venture was on the same lines as the coffee public house; an alternative to places of immoral and improvident excesses but modelled, to a large extent, on such 'hot spots'. Its purpose, however, accentuated the differences between them and led to failure. The first premises was the rented Royal Victoria of South London; it was teetotal, and within one year was badly in debt. The entrance price did not provide enough revenue to pay top artistes and the enterprise was not run with the same degree of financial ruthlessness of the commercial music halls. As with other improvement efforts which floundered 'it demonstrates ... how authentic reproduction of a vigorous popular ritual eluded outsiders whose principal concern was control and dilution.'[p.163] Moreover, as one contemporary critic said, 'There was an air of patronage about the place, which the Briton, even in his most

unpolished condition, will at once detect.'[from *Coffee Public House News* 1st May 1884.] Some visitors to the hall objected to the temperance propaganda which could include slide shows of the physical effects of drink, (for example, diseased livers.)

Later, when the big halls were very big business and they no longer had to rely on the revenue from drink and the emphasis was on the acts, the attendance of women was actively encouraged. As the century progressed, although women were in the minority among music hall audiences, there is evidence to suggest that there was increased attendance by younger working class women.[Bailey, 1978, p.155 - here he uses the casualty figures in various music hall fires.] One writer extols Morton's attempt to attract women to attend, 'as a boon to working class women because the stimulation would be a respite from the monotony of fireside knitting by the respectable and the fighting in gin shops by the otherwise.'[Felstead, 1947, p.22] The decision to include women and eventually families, was said to have been prompted by Morton's concern for marital harmony. Escott said that although music halls were not exactly the height of moral refinement, they could counteract drunkenness, especially since they were being reformed. He tells us that in the early 1880's, "at least a proportion of it consists of genuinely family parties." [Escott, 1885, p.540] Bailey, however, describes the moves towards respectability which characterises the approach of the later (especially West End) music halls, as the provision of 'better business as well as sound defence.' [1978, p.164] Thus, when some halls no longer had to rely on bar takings to pay their stars, the push was on to include women and also the upper classes (although there had always been certain upper class and 'bohemian' literary groups who frequented the halls and who

'slummed' it in the pubs) in a curious mixture of business acumen and an apparent interest in moral improvement. Bailey notes some of the financial benefits raked in from the de-emphasising of drink and the bigger, more luxurious halls. For one thing, the space saved by the banishing of auditorium drinking could be used for more seats, stall seating was becoming more common and the absence of promenades made price differentials more easy to manage, encouraged reservations and facilitated the success of the twice nightly performance.

Altogether, it led to a more efficient use of time and resources. Some suburban music halls were also becoming plush *enough* to attract a middle class audience although many of the provincial halls still maintained an image of ribaldry that did not encourage the latter to go.

Manders and Mitcheson include contemporary accounts of the later music halls. One describes the London Pavilion reconstruction of 1886 where tables were abolished and tip-up seats installed - an innovation for reservations and 'In 1900 the whole of the interior was rebuilt by the Syndicate, who announced that they had "found it necessary to cater for the growth of a public taste for art, elegance, and luxury of appointments." (Manders & Mitcheson, 1974, p49)

Another, written in 1895, sees this development as:

a fresh era in music hall history. It marked the final and complete severance of the variety stage from its old associations of the tavern and the concert saloon ... (the) tawdry music hall of the past gave place to the resplendent "theatre of varieties" of the present day, with its classic exterior of marble and freestone, its lavishly appointed auditorium and its elegant and luxurious foyers and promenades brilliantly illuminated by myriad electric lights. Hitherto, the halls had been almost exclusively patronised by a class composed mainly, if not exclusively, of the lower and middle grade of society, that huge section of the public comprehensively summed up in the term 'the people'. Now, however, wealth, fashions and *ton* became

attracted to these handsome 'Palaces' of amusement and in the grand saloon of the West End halls the most prominent and distinguished representatives of art, literature and the law mingled nightly with city financiers ... 1974
[In Manders & Mitcheson, p.49, from Stuart and Park, *The Variety Stage*,]

The music hall has been described as 'a prosperous national industry' as 'a form of amusement peculiarly designed for the lower classes' and in its later form as a place of respectable family entertainment.[Felstead, 1947, p.11] According to one working class critic of 1913, however, one's view of this depends upon which years one describes; if the later years, then it all seems to be irrelevant to the working class because 'there are not any music halls. In the sense that the music hall is a place of popular entertainment, a place for the amusement and enjoyment of the common people, it has ceased to exist in London, and there are very few vestiges left of it anywhere in the Kingdom.'[Cheshire, 1974, p.52. from Charles E. Hands - *A Common Person's Complaint* Daily Mail, 25th Nov. 1913] The moralists and the artists are fighting for the control of 'our music halls' and the common people 'look on ... It does not matter to us whether in the future the music hall is to realise the ideals of the artistic or to satisfy the requirements of the moralists. We have lost it anyway. The two conflicting factions make up the conquering hordes of the upper and middle classes and between them they have taken our music halls from us ... ' As for the improvements in entertainment, they have had the same effect which is the 'exclusion from the auditorium of the vulgar working class population.' The physical improvements were no less exclusive:

The County Council, as soon as it came into existence, set itself to purify popular amusements, and as soon as it got well to work the big central music halls were purified of their pit seats and the whole of

the floor space was filled up with stalls at the popular price of seven and sixpence or half a guinea apiece, The only place left for us was a gallery two miles high, and that at a price that made a big hole in the weeks spending money.

As to our own little local music halls, the purifying effect on them was to cause them to be floated with enormous capital and rebuilt as palaces and empires and hippodromes or under some other fancy names with such expense of marble and gilding and emergency exits that we could not get past the box office. What passes for an evening's amusement at one of them is a seat on a back bench or in a high gallery for an hour and a half at one of the quick turn twice nightlies. So, the most we can expect to get is half an evening's amusement, and for fear we should get too fond of that, they won't let us have any beer. So that if we want an occasional evening's complete enjoyment we have to spend half of it in a palace and half of it in a public house, and neither of them quite satisfies us ...

Out of the population of London there are five millions of us who habitually stop away from the music halls. Believe me, it is not because we do not want to enjoy ourselves or have lost the capacity of enjoyment. We have not left the music halls. The music halls have left us ... (Cheshire, 1974, p52, Extract from Charles Hands letter to Daily Mail, 1913)

Many writers on the music hall stress the working class appeal of its 'down-to-earth' artists and of their identification with them and their songs, [Scott, Manders and Mitcheson, Felstead], but there are some who hint at the gradually increasing distance of artist from audience - (Bailey, Lowerson and Myerscough). This was not merely due to the new architectural changes, but also involved questions of class and professionalism. With the huge salaries commanded by a few top performers and the monopoly of the big theatres over them, 'In this way, the mass entertainment industry began to emerge, with its palatable messages delivered by 'classless' artists of the widest possible commercial appeal to the respectable audiences which flocked to see them.' [Lowerson & Myerscough, 1977, p.82] D.F. Cheshire, in *Music Hall in Britain* describes how Albert Chevalier, an ex-character actor turned coster-singer, helped by his manager, made the music hall act acceptable to the middle classes by giving 'extensive seasons' of afternoon concerts

at the Queens Hall in London and also at provincial concert halls. He sometimes sang his coster songs in West End drawing room recitals in the 1890's, but he revealed that they were rather chilly affairs.[Cheshire, 1947, p.66]

Other music hall acts had a long history in popular entertainments; the singer and comic-singer were long standing favourites from the fairs and circuses (see Cheshire, 1974, pp.13 & 16 for a description of the variety booths of fair.) The juggling and clown 'turns' had also existed at fairs such as St. Bartholomew's which had died in the 1850's. Conjuring acts and feats of strength and acrobats were also adapted for the music hall stage and they included many weird and wonderful ways of astonishing their audience, such as human cannon balls, underwater stunts and there was one man, Captain Slater, who purported to have an asbestos mouth and who made members of the audience faint in horror.[See Felstead, 1947, p.48] Variety also encompassed the animal acts like the boxing kangaroos, freak shows and even the testimonies of criminals, many of which still worked at fairs, exhibitions and sometimes in pubs, [Scott, 1946, pp.196-7] Some of these acts purported to be part of popular education and the sensational nature of some of the testimonials, for example, the experiences of American slaves and Indians. One 'well remembered' act described by Felstead, was a Dr. Brodie, who presented himself as able to cure paralysis and rheumatism and numerous other ailments by using hypnotism and electricity. He commanded huge salaries and attracted big audiences wherever he appeared, many of whom were 'a class of people who had never before entered their portals.' [Felstead, 1947, pp.50-1. He was eventually forced to withdraw his act by violent medical students incensed at his criticism of their hospital.]

These acts carried the sensational appeal that had drawn custom in the fairs and some were taken very seriously so that they even attracted the upper classes to the music hall. We have not seen any direct evidence to suggest this was the immediate aim of the managers, but certainly it fulfilled the general aim of many music hall managements.

One of the first tactics to that end, along with the luxury and palatial environment, was the picture gallery. Morton had had one installed at the Canterbury Hall in the 1850's. He began by turning the foyer ... a most spacious affair, into a fashionable art gallery. Around the walls were displayed expensive pictures by the fashionable artists of the time - notable among them being W.P. Frith, (of *Derby Day* fame), Rosa Bonheur, William Herring, the painter of horses, David Maclise and many others whose work is still remembered. (Manders & Mitcheson, 1974, p.24) Eventually, he bought so many that he built a separate hall to house them and on Sunday nights, they attracted 'many thousands' of visitors. Felstead describes this as his trump card of refinement against the monopoly of the singing saloons such as the Coal Hole or the Cider Cellar.

Cheshire calls this picture gallery of Morton's a 'publicity stunt' and quotes from an article in *The Builder* [6.11.1858] which tells of 'extraneous attractions to taverns.' It says with their displays of natural history specimens, some were more like museums than hostelryes and were trying to draw custom 'by some kind of intellectual pleasure.' (This, as Altick has shown, was common among 17th Century coffee taverns. Evan's was a song and supper room for men - see Scott, 1947, p.118, Manders & Mitcheson, 1974, p.10, Cheshire, 1974, p.20, for a picture - and in 1856 when a new room was built the old one became an art

gallery of theatrical pictures. Evan's closed in 1880.) Scott, [1947, p.134], makes the point that the two main features of Evan's, was its principal comedian and the idea of a picture gallery. The article in *The Builder* continues with an account of Morton's gallery seeing the same intellectual, 'improving' motives as the pubs:

The proprietor says, in a preface to the catalogue, - Although almost every other class of the community is represented at the Canterbury Hall, his chief supporters are to be found among the working classes. If then, while providing for them the innocent and enlivening enjoyment of music in the hall, the fine arts gallery can be made the medium for raising in their minds enobling and refining thoughts, and of creating and fostering a taste for the beautiful, the proprietor feels that his establishment can prefer a fresh claim to public support. This is a new language from such a source, and not without its import. The attraction of the tavern, 'pure and simple,' must be fading, since it is necessary to add others of an intellectual character.
[In Cheshire, 1974, p.26]

Morton's concern for the moral welfare of the lower classes gave him prestige and publicity, for 'The thought of a picture gallery in a music hall in Lambeth, among the homes of the poor, fascinated everyone.' [Scott, 1946, p.134] It was dubbed the 'Royal Academy over the water' by a writer in *Punch* (Augustus Sala) and various other critics pointed to it as an example of this music hall's educative purpose. Scott writes that even then, Morton's aim was to draw the wealthier patron; firstly by engaging Sam Cowell the comedian from Evan's, but 'to attain this end, a romantic glamour was the first consideration, a glamour combined with a sound reputation for pioneer work in promoting rational amusement. Morton's scheme was a revolutionary one only in respect of its geographical location.' [Scott, 1946, p.135]

The picture gallery also contained 'amusing and instructive books, and all the current papers and periodicals.' It was very popular on

Sundays and as Scott says, all this could help to disarm critics of music halls and Sunday opening. The lure of a gallery was also a way of getting people to go along and see for themselves what the music hall was like. There was also in London, another art gallery in the Surrey Music Hall and an advert of 1853 states that The Grand Picture Gallery, is now Open every Sunday for Refreshments.[Manders and Mitcheson, 1974, p.30. In the Canterbury's gallery, it was also possible to get good cheap meals.] Morton also gained much publicity and 'moral kudos'[ibid] from the various law suits brought against him for his staging of drama in defiance of the 1843 Act. In one case the magistrate spoke favourably of the performance - a condensed version of 'The Tempest' and fined him just £5. *The Times* covered the case and thus gave publicity to a music hall and soon after even accepted, for the first time, an advertisement of music hall entertainment from Morton. On Morton's 80th birthday, there was a celebratory matinee to him at the Palace Theatre, a luxurious new music hall which he was conducting, and at the end he was given a rhymed address in appreciation of his life's work. The second verse is typical of the whole drift:

Sixty or seventy years ago, in the days of the "drinking den,"
The jokes they made and the songs they sang, were sorrow to
Englishmen,
If you doubt my word, take Thackeray down, and Colonel Newcome call
To tell the tale of the days of "Ross", and the shudder at vile "Sam
Hall",
But he dreamed of the Madrigal, Grand Old Man, and the English Catch
and Glee,
And murmured, "Pleasure it should be pure, and Art it must be free."
So he opened a "Sing Song bright and gay, Vice took to its heels and
ran",
Said the women, "Oh! Governor! Let us in!" "You shall come," said
the Grand Old Man,

And when Morton died in 1904, the obituary in the Era stressed his abstemiousness and energy, but, as Scott points out, all the measures taken to improve the music hall were the lynchpins in his financial success.

Scott traces the relationship between the music hall and the 'improving entertainment' and describes how [the latter]:

in its day incorporated and even created some elements of the later music hall, and which, in the Alhambra, provided it with such an imposing edifice. At least three genuinely popular shows were the outcome of this frenzy for educating the popular mind ... the Minstrels, which very early in their career suffered this moral translation, Maskelyne and Cook's Home of Mystery at the Egyptian Hall, and the German Reed Burletta Theatre at the Gallery of Illustration. Moreover, beneath the surface of such titling as Eidophusikon, Eidouranium, Peristrophic Diorama and the like, which would appear to have made a Greek Lexicon indispensable to the equipment of the middle class home, one may discern many sublimated forms of entertainment which are relevant to the subject of this book. (Scott, 1946, p185)

Such schemes which chose to combine education and pleasure chose sites which later proved to be 'a happy hunting-ground' for more entertainment orientated shows later on. One of the first of the popular education efforts with this quality of showmanship and 'serious' intent, was on a sufficiently grand scale to call itself the Polytechnic Institute 1826. Its pride in the Industrial Revolution stretched over fifty years. There is a description of a typical invitation day in 1878 which, from morning to evening, provided a steady programme of illustrated lectures on such topics as India and natural history, new inventions such as typewriters, juggling shows, musical entertainment and demonstrations of potters' techniques.

Another similar institution was the Panoptikon 1854, (it closed in 1858 and became London's largest music hall.) The motives for its

establishment was a recognition of the increased population and the concomitant need for and indeed increased taste for, intellectual pursuits. It appears to have been a manufacturers' Mechanics' Institute as a pamphlet to the management committee points out, 'the manufacturer, by devoting a few hours weekly to the enunciation of the chemistry Professor, will be better prepared to meet that competition, which, though the very life of Commercial enterprise, is ever fatal to the indulgence of inactivity or ignorance'. (Scott, 1946, p.187 Written by Mr. Marmaduke Clarke, a scientific instrument maker, who conceived the idea of a Panoptikon.] The building, began in 1850, after the granting of a Royal Charter, was Saracenic in style and its very edifice was to be of service to the community or as the Royal Institute of British Architects put it, 'independent of serving the office of ornaments, they (the minarets) are likely to become ... instrumental of paramount benefit to the community at large, 'But, as Scott says, the exact nature of the service was never explained.

There were two parts to the daily sessions with the mornings reserved for the scientific and the evenings for 'artistic entertainment' to fulfill the aims of education in the guise of amusement. (The exhibits of 'scientific exposition' are listed by Scott and include an interesting set of mostly industrial inventions;' ... the Diving Apparatus, a demonstration of Hydrostation (or the ascensional force of balloons in water), E.M. Clarke's electrical machine, Holme's Vacuum-Coated Flask, the Aurora Borealis Apparatus, the Thunder House, the Manufacture of Pins, the Gas Cooking Apparatus, Sculpture, Cork Hats, the Patent Ornamental Sewing Machine, the Euphatine, an Exhibition of Pyrography (i.e. poker painting) ... ')

Another branch of the popular education interest, but with a more direct link with showbusiness, was the one-man show. It had enjoyed some popularity in the 18th Century and became 'so frequently requisitioned by the promoters of instructional amusement.' (Famous examples were Charles Dibdin in the 18th Century and Charles Matthews Senior, later Albert Smith and John Orlando Parry, in the 19th Century.)

Two such entertainers, Dibdin and the later Parry, had many features in common in that they both had musical training, had sung in opera, wrote and composed sketches, songs and monologues and had a talent for drawing which they used in their acts. Smith had a more intellectual image and described himself as a lecturer. An example of his work which proved extremely popular, was the 1851 musical lecture on the ascent of Mount Blanc, in the Egyptian Hall. The vogue for such lectures was often so strong that some ran for over one year.

Scott says that such music hall stars as Corney Grain and Barclay Gammon, who sang at the piano, were part of this tradition, but 'their appeal has never been noticeably popular outside the West End proper ...' [Felstead, 1947, p.171. At the first Royal Command Performance in 1912, Gammon was billed third with 'at the piano, will intermingle "Rule Britannia" with "In the Shadows" and sing of "The Suffragettes" - a mixture of patriotism and topicality.

Cheshire includes a list of 'London Concert Halls, Music Halls and Entertainment Galleries' [p.102. From a table compiled for the Report of the Select Committee on Theatrical Licences and Regulations 1866] which were built between 1851-1864 along with building costs and seating capacities. It includes places from the Crystal Palace to the Alhambra and the Polytechnic to the Canterbury. Here is middle class popular

entertainment included in a list with that of the working class and at a time when the bigger halls were moving to create a sort of amalgamation of the two, both in programmes and audience. They wanted to become respectable through the attendance of middle and upper class patrons. (Within many of the 'improvement' efforts and indeed the early social reformers plans, one of the main assets felt to be useful, was the presence of middle class people to guide through teaching and example. The music hall was reliant on their presence to give a particular ambiance as though they were endowed with the Midas touch of respectability.)

Whilst it may be argued that the elevating ambitions of the music hall were, for the most part, confined to the de-luxe types, there were, nevertheless, (as we saw in the temperance music halls), connections between improvement ideology and regional and suburban halls, not least in the use of dioramas and panoramas. A diorama was, however, a costly and complicated piece of machinery that was also difficult to transport. Robert Wood [1967, p.14], describes a typical diorama: the audience sat in a circular room facing a window through which they could see into a well-lit outer room, showing, for example, a battle scene and the room would then turn a semi-circle to face another window, (hence the name, diorama, for while watching one scene the next was being prepared.) Scott (1946) mentions the peep show and the later panorama 'as elements of miscellaneous entertainment in the music hall, eventually eliminated by the cinema. A reflection of Victorian earnestness may perhaps be discerned in the early devotion of the art in these surroundings to material of a semi-educational character.' [p.204] And Wood continues the analogy between the music hall and cinema by describing the panorama or diorama as 'the

equivalent of our news reels and travelogues and (they) had the additional advantage of being in part at least, three dimensional, most decidedly educational, and absolutely and without doubt, strictly moral.'(Wood, 1967 p13)

A brief description of the commercial side to the music hall business and its results, may, at this point, be useful both as an example of capitalism and entertainment and as a contrast to and comparison with reforming types of entertainment and recreation. As we stated above, there were some similarities and at the very least, an awareness, on the part of some managers, of their social responsibility or of their being *seen* to fulfil this recognised responsibility. They realised that this could have concrete financial benefits. *The Financial News* [p.15, 1887] advised people to invest in the music hall: "If it paid well ten years ago, it should pay much better today, for many more people frequent it and people of a better kind than formerly ... " [Cited in Bailey, 1978, p.150]

Scott points out that the music hall did not develop until the 19th Century because before then, 'the age of capitalism had not yet arrived.' In the first half of the century, however, many outlying districts of London boasted tavern saloons where there were variety acts, dancing and plays (which died out with the 1834 Act.) One such was the Eagle Tavern (the tavern of the famous rhyme, 'Pop goes the Weasel') and this quote from a visitor in 1839, tells of the ingenuity used to attract custom:

Take them all in all, these tavern-theatres, whether pernicious or otherwise in their tendency, are curious and interesting as instances of the inventive skill of modern luxury. The capital which the proprietors of some of these places have embarked upon them, is immense. But the return is derived in many ways besides the mere receipts of the evening entertainments described. The Eagle Tavern, for example, attracts many visitors by day, who desire to see the pleasure grounds and decorations around, and, at certain seasons,

fireworks, small balloons, and other pageantries, attract great crowds,
[Manders and Micheson, 1974, p.17. Taken from *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal* June 1839]

Organised and regular entertainments also attracted bigger audiences . when, by an act of 1853, the tax on press advertising was abolished and there was increased coverage in the newspapers of 'nocturnal entertainment'. There was also the introduction of horse omnibuses in 1855, which encouraged longer trips for entertainment outside immediate neighbourhoods. Cheshire adds to this the fact that street lighting had improved, along with the Police Force, so that people felt it was safer to venture out at night at least 'on main thoroughfares'[p.24]. Increased coverage in the press was not confined to newspapers; an article in *The Art Journal* April 1856, gave an account of the rebuilt Evan's supper-room, (the year Paddy Green made the old hall into an art gallery), which says it was an example of the 'artistic improvements' in our places of public resort' ... A very few years ago it would have been impossible to have alluded to this improvement at all; but to the present proprietor, Mr. Green, is due the honour of having elevated the moral tone of its amusements and made them unobjectionable.' [Quoted by Cheshire, 1974, p.24]

The development of the commercial side of the halls, had many effects on the form of the entertainment offered. When limited liability companies were introduced in 1862, it made it possible for greater investment in the more successful music hall. In 1864, for example, the Alhambra became the first of the music halls to be run by a limited liability company and paid very good dividends, [See Bailey, p.148 and Cheshire p.103]. By the 1880's, the music hall was being recommended as a

sound investment 'for many people now frequent it and people of a better kind than formerly - if it continues to refine itself and to heap novelty on novelty as it does, it will go on growing.' [From *Financial News* 15.2.82. In Bailey, 1978, p.150] It did continue to expand and at the turn of the century, novelty and refinement were the hallmarks of variety entertainment.

In the books on music hall history, there are a few names which are mentioned over and over again. We have seen that of Morton, 'The Father of the English Music Hall', but most of the 'big' names among the entrepreneurs began their careers in the provinces, became part of large syndicates and eventually moved to London. Three such men were Edward Moss, (later knighted,) Oswald Stoll and Richard Thornton. Moss was the son of a Scottish entertainer and had helped his father at fair pitches; Thornton was a Tynesider who joined up with Moss in a successful music hall partnership that controlled interests as far South as Wales; Stoll had family connections with the music hall business and took over a management job on his step-father's property in Liverpool. He also started a prosperous music hall agency and bought a music hall in Cardiff, (The Cardiff Empire.) Extending his activities to other Western towns, he came into competition with the Moss/Thornton partnership and later joined with them. In an attempt to go it alone, he left the combine in 1903 and the following year, he had the London Hippodrome built. It was the most luxurious hall up to that time and cost £300,000. Within a year, however, due to lack 'of working capital,' he rejoined Moss and Thornton and they could now coordinate bookings. [Felstead, 1947, pp.111-3] Moss Empires Ltd., was registered in December, 1899, and they had an impressive list of properties throughout the country. Later, the power of

the Moss Empire attracted smaller companies who were struggling to survive in the face of competition from radio and film. Such an attempt to join them, was made by the London Theatres of Variety Ltd., and the Variety Theatres Controlling Company, Ltd., under the name of the former. They went bankrupt in 1928 'while Moss Empires, with its greater array of theatres and connections, continued to prosper.' [Cheshire, 1974, p.105]

As we have discussed, by the turn of the century, the two characteristics of the big music hall also represented by such men as Stoll, were respectability and novelty. The London Coliseum was to be a place of family entertainment and he aimed to cut out the bad language and prostitution. The stalls and boxes accommodated 'the cream of society' and proved a sound investment and good for investment. Felstead describes Stoll as a businessman first and foremost, contrasting with the 'free and easy Bohemianism' of some of his rivals.

One of the obvious outcomes of financial success, was the bigger and palatial buildings and the survival of the financially fittest in the wake of more stringent safety regulations. Another result was the lavish and 'theatrical programmes encouraged by those halls with their 'full theatrical apparatus of a stage and proscenium arch.' [Bailey, 1978, p.151]

We have already described some of the variety 'turns' of the late 19th and early 20th Century. Added to these more circus-type acts, there were now excerpts of serious drama and ballet. [Felstead, 1947, p.114] (At the top end of the scale these acts included such names as Pavlova and Bernhardt.) Under Stoll, acts were to be high class and cultural occasionally, for he 'believed that there was a huge and comparatively untapped goldmine in catering for the family element to whom the old time "halls" were an anathema.' [Felstead, 1947, p.110] There were more

seats in the newer theatres, but the entrance prices were higher. Many were, however, willing to pay the price for what one writer describes as an almost heavenly experience - 'for a nimble fourpence, and threepence extra for an early door, you could enter those pearly gates which had arisen in St. Martin's Lane, London, under the argus-eyed man who intended to "clean-up" the halls.'

The platform had become a stage and this distance between the performer and audience, begun, according to Bailey, with the Canterbury, facilitated the star-making process by creating 'star appeal'. [Bailey, 1978, p.151] In many halls, however, the dialogue between the artist and spectator 'the essence of music hall entertainment' remained and these were the smaller provincial and suburban halls. [Felstead, 1947, pp.180-1] which had no great pretensions to attracting the upper classes. The music hall as an entertainment industry had also created a labour force of professional performers, songwriters and agencies, all vying to protect their own interests. Where proprietors owned more than one hall, they tended to use the same acts at a number of their theatres on the same night at different times. This meant that the acts could no longer mix with the audience as previously, because they had to cross London to meet deadlines. (This led to militant action and Trade Union activity in the '70's and '80's, including a strike. See Bailey, 1978, p.151). Scott accuses these halls of being much too big 'for any intimate relationship between the artist and the audience,' [p.180] and says that the rival syndicates vied with each other using extravagant wages to secure long contracts with the stars. This, according to one comic singer, led to a situation where 'you saw a company of artists for a couple of weeks; then they would disappear for a week ... and back they would come again - the same

old faces and the same old business.'[Harry Randall, quoted n.1, *ibid*] And while Scott congratulates the provinces for keeping 'the old order' alive, another writer points to the increase in touring encouraged by rail travel, which, while never completely destroying the regional differences in tastes for entertainment, led to a greater standardisation in the style and the content of music hall performance.[Bailey, 1978, p.152]

It is often stated that the intimacy of the 'old order' was built on an identification between the artists, their songs and the working class audience. It is implied that this true recognition, shown through intimacy and response, is a true gauge of the music hall as a democratic form of entertainment. We should now like to examine some of the artists and their material, to see how far this is a true impression.

Music is still and always was, seen as a predominantly working class form of entertainment. Some middle class people even accused it of exercising a system of class prejudice in reverse. One artist, Jenny Hill, was one of the many, (including Marie Lloyd), who came from the slums (see Scott, 1946, pp.206-208) to work in the saloons and eventually in the music hall. In her particular case, it was the dire financial straits caused after the birth of her child, which forced her to push herself when she did. Although often billed as comedienne, she also performed melodramatic sketch/songs about street life, which became popular in the 1880's. One, entitled *The City Waif*, tells of 'the humour and the resilience of the street Arab'[Scott, 1946, p.207], the prostitute helping a crippled sister and the exploitation of a working girl by an upper class man. Scott describes this song as being the 'intense instinct of class consciousness' by a working class singer. It is true that music hall songs and artists were often class conscious, but the limitations of

recognition alone (more appropriate here than class consciousness with its 'critical' overtones) are apparent when some of the lyrics of the songs are examined.

Using Martha Vicinus' studies of 19th Century working class poetry, (*The Lowly Harp; Nineteenth Century Working Class Poetry*. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1969, and the Study of Nineteenth Century British Working Class Poetry, in *The Politics of Literature*, New York, 1972, pp.322-353), Francis Hearn discusses how 'prior to the onslaught on working class culture', poems and songs gave the workers a sense of continuity and remembrance of experience, by linking present grievances to traditional themes. Up to the 1830's, the theme in working class poetry was usually about the workplace, and also 'expressed the 18th Century emphasis on natural rights.' (Hearn, 1978, p.151) Political songs expressed solidarity and courage, but later, with the attacks on working class culture, the emphasis of the songs and poetry was on the vagaries of life - fate and chance - 'Gone are the references to the workers' ability to provide solutions to the problems they daily encountered. Instead, the emphasis was on submission to time: with the passage of time, problems would generate their own solutions.' (Hearn, 1978, p.152)

Examples of music hall songs, which emphasise fate and the inexplicability of life, are numerous. One songwriter, Harry Clifton, wrote the lyrics to more than 500 songs 'frequently nothing but gross plagiarism of a well known ditty ... set to music by a hack composer.' (Felstead, 1947, p.29) They included sentimental exhortations to 'Paddle Your Own Canoe' and as the words of one song encourage:

Work, boys, work and be contented,
As long as you've enough to buy a meal,
For you know you may rely,

You'll be wealthy by and by,
If you only put your shoulder to the wheel,

Another example in the same vein was a song performed by Gertie Gitana and which was a 'tremendous favourite'; it went:

Though your heart be full of pain, never mind,
'''
You'll be happy once again never mind, (Felstead, 1947,
.p.1701

Clifton's lyrics told people to cheer up and to wait for 'the turn of the tide' and were full of optimism 'tinged with Christian resignation,'[Scott, 1946, p.126] and according to one source, were 'as popular in the drawing room as in the music hall.'[Manders and Mitcheson, 1974 p.38] This was no wonder, for often the themes of the songs epitomised the values of the middle class and they were the values that they wished upon the working class. Self-help, patriotism, sentimentality about the home and basic happiness, were common subjects, as well as topics about common working class experiences. These were often humorous singalongs complaining about the lack of money to pay the rent man or about crowded conditons.

One writer says that many such songs 'must have given great satisfaction to those members of his (Clifton's) audience, who were employers of labour; but it is a part of the strange psychology of music hall audiences that this kind of sentiment is invariably well received.' The way to an understanding of this seemingly paradoxical situation, is rooted in the desire and acceptance of entertainment in the city and in the differences between those on the providing and the receiving ends of the halls, the songs and the artists. It has been emphasised by many

writers on the music hall that, unlike modern light entertainment, the halls encouraged participation and that the audience were quick to show their disapproval of acts. However, in terms of the amount of control over the format, management decisions, choice and composition of material, they can still be seen as relatively passive. Hearn says that the music hall, along with the pub, expanded to meet the demand for 'light commercial entertainment'[p.152] and Felstead, (referring here to the smaller halls and their provision of one big star and many minor acts), says unequivocally that 'The public would go to anything to be amused ... ' Thus, the content of the songs was not, in itself, of major importance in determining the entire popularity of the music hall, for there was a great attraction in the presentation and style of the production and the songs. Here is a description from the painter W.R. Sickert, which gives some idea of the reasons for the appeal of the music hall:

I was intensely impressed by the pictorial beauty of the scene, created by the coincidence of a number of fortuitious elements of form and colour. A graceful girl leaning forward from the stage, to accentuate the refrain of one of the sentimental ballads so dear to the frequenters of the halls, evoked a spontaneous movement of sympathy and attention in an audience whose sombre tones threw into brilliant relief the animated movement of the singer, bathed as she was in a ray of green limelight from the centre of the roof, and from below on the yellow radiance of the footlights ...
[Cheshire, 1974, p.89]

Of the tradition of working class poetry, Vicinus says that gradually, 'working men with serious poetic aspirations, denied their traditional culture for the ideal of 'pure poetry', which they believed was part of the mainstream of English poetry.' [Hearn, '78, p153] Taken from Vicinus, *The Lowly Harp* p.143] The only exceptions to this were places such as tight-

knit mining communities. Dialect poetry was, instead, pushed as being traditionally working class, but this only 'revived the tradition in a framework of middle class values' with its themes of happy homes and leisure time and the nobility of thrift and temperance as the solutions and causes for the ills of society and poverty. This was, to some extent, what was happening with the songs of the halls, many of which were middle class in virtually all but the way in which they were presented, for example, in Cockney accent and working clothes. As for poetry, Hearn believes that the middle class began to use the language of the working class and their activities to promote middle class values and this deprived working class poetry of its critical nature. By the end of the century, dialect poetry was big business, both for the writers and the publishers.

Similarly, music hall songs became big business. The lyricist and composer were, more often than not, lower-middle class and the subject matter did reflect 'common working class afflictions.' [Senelick, 1975, p.151] As Hearn says, 'essential to the extensive popularity of the music hall, was its recognition of distinctive working class concerns.' [1978, p.153]

But how much did this support of the music hall mean that the songs were expressions of the vox populi? One modern critic of the vox populi viewpoint argues that the politics of the music hall song should be seen 'not as a genuine expression of the discontent or opinion or policy of an oppressed stratum of society, but as a true-blue ultra-conservative declaration of loyalty or a knowing bit of sarcasm.' [Senelick, 1975, p.151] The working class may have been in the audience, but what Senelick is pointing out is that they did not necessarily form the values and styles on display.

Felstead, however, says that those who decry the sentimental and patriotic songs, have no understanding of "the real British character." They were, he maintains, truly popular. One is left somewhat puzzled about what he means by 'truly popular'. What *is* true is that such songs were very successful propaganda enveloped in catchy melodies, rhyming verses, the personality of the artist and the music hall itself as a night out - entertainment. As such, they were often well-received, with the patriotic overtures used as devices to unite the audience. As propaganda, they were successful and likewise for the box office. Nearly all the writers on the music hall cited here, mention the name G.H. MacDermott - (The Great MacDermott) and his song about the Eastern Question in 1877, which included these lines:

We don't want to fight,
But, by Jingo, if we do,
We've got the ships, we've got the men,
And we've got the money, too.⁴

Scott reports that both singer and composer, G.W. Hunt, 'took the song very seriously as a contribution to foreign policy.'[p.170] And J.A. Hobson, who wrote *The Psychology of Jingoism*, writing at the turn of the century, accredits the music hall as a 'potent educator' and more influential than school, church or press.[Hobson, p.3. London 1901. In Senelick, 1975, p.150]

The word jingo, was converted into an 'ism' by the press and became a very well known term. And although this goes down on music hall history as a popular rabble-rousing song, there are examples of resistance within the halls, to jingoism. There was a burlesque of it

performed by Herbert Campbell and written by Pettit, which, as Scott says, 'exhibits a healthy reaction.'(Scott, 1946, p170)

I don't want to fight,
I'll be slaughtered if I do.
I'd let the Russians have Constantinople,⁴

and

Newspapers talk of Russian hate,
Of its ambitions tell,
Of course they want a war because
It makes the papers sell,
Let all the politicians
Who desire to help the Turk
Put on the uniform themselves
And go and do the work!

Also, in the late seventies, there was a sketch/song performed by Charles Godfrey called 'On Guard' about a veteran from the Crimean war who is rejected by everyone - even the work-house. It was performed in the West End's London Pavillion, but was curtailed through the request of 'several officers of the Household Brigade'(Scott, 1946, p.215) who told the manager that it could have a damaging effect on recruiting. The stream of patriotic songs, however, continued up to, and during, the First World War and they became more blatantly anti-German.(Cheshire, 1974, p.54, includes the memory of Rupert Brooke who first heard of the outbreak of war in a music hall where the news was flashed up on a screen, but he recalls a mood of 'tragedy and dignity.')

Many music hall tunes were tailored to the themes of departing soldiers, but by 1916, there was a growing cynicism to the patriotic 'blighty' expressed in them. Cheshire quotes a poem called 'Blighters', by

Sigfried Sassoon, which, he says, echoed the feelings of many disillusioned soldiers:

I'd like to see a Tank come down the stalls,
Lurching to rag-time tunes, or 'Home, sweet Home',
And there'd be no more jokes in music halls
To mock the riddled corpses round Bapaume,
(Cheshire, 1974, p55)

One thing that has to be borne in mind, is the fact that patriotic songs, if not themselves in a comic vein, were sandwiched between comic songs which were the most dominant form of act in the music hall. Comic acts dominated, both in terms of numbers and in the amount of money they could command. This policy came to a climax in the London syndicate halls. Scott, 1946, [p.204], believes that these acts predominated because they allowed the singer to show 'the most direct expression of personality.' Subjects ranged from food - for example 'I Like Pickled Onions' by Harry Champion, who specialised in food 'material', - to drink and sex. The subjects were basic and centered on common experiences and gave scope for what Senelick called 'knowing sarcasm.'

There was a dearth of drink songs - 'Yes, you couldn't beat booze to tickle your public, even down to:

Beer, beer, glorious beer,
Fill yourself right up to 'ere.' [Felstead, 1947, p95)

These lines were written by someone who had definite interests in drink sales, Sir Augustus Harris, known as 'the Director of Drury Lane.' This subject was very common in the 1870's and '80's, when the temperance movement was in full swing and a glance at a song book of the time shows how many drink songs were plugged. [See Cheshire, 1974, p.84] Cheshire

explains that the music hall helped to keep beer sales up through depression and temperance efforts. The music hall was not, it seems, above self-interested propaganda.

The music hall was yet another arena in which political ideas were cast and it can also be seen in terms of a 'civilizing process.' The next Chapter goes into this concept, (which reveals class and ideas) underlying the politics of the 'progress' and 'civilization'. Later, this is explored in The Great Exhibition and museums and galleries.

Notes

- [1] Hugh Cunningham states that the term 'leisure', at the end of the 18th Century, referred to "free non-obligated time and for the mass of the people such time was illegitimate." Leisure was legitimate only for the rich, for the poor it was idleness. Cunningham describes how "leisure" began to be used in the late 19th Century "to describe the non-work time or activities of the mass of the people ... "(Cunningham, 1980, p12 & p13)
- [2] There is a very interesting article, by E.G. Dunning, - Football in its Early Stages, History Today, December 1963, p.838-847 - (though I do not include such sports as football, cricket etc.) Football is explored in terms of the "civilising process", through its early origins, the public school and as a mass sport. See also Chapter 3 above.
- [3] It is interesting that dog fighting has been discovered to be fairly popular now in some areas and there have been horrific stories told in recent court cases. Some take place in secluded barns etc., but some are run by *middle class people* in their swimming pools and large sums of money change hands. Further study could reveal whether this 'upsurge' is a recent phenomenon, or whether it has continued unabated.
- [4] A recent 'Timewatch' programme [BBC 2 - 5.9.85], explored the use by the Tories of the music hall as a part of a strategy to appeal to the working class. In the music hall, Randolph Churchill was characterised by artistes, who sang songs with such lyrics as "I speak out and so should you." The image the Tories wished to get over was the self-image of the working class; as lovers of pleasure,

plain speaking, courage, for popular pastimes, against utopian solutions. The programme described this as a sleight of hand, hiding the Tory Party's landed interests whilst appearing to cross class boundaries. (People like Disraeli aspired to the country gent lifestyle.) "We don't want to fight ... " was revived in the last two decades and the Tories continued to build up local Tory Associations. One of these, The Primrose League, specialised in singing, teas and political speeches.

CHAPTER 3.

Civilisation and Progress	184.
Evolutionary Theory	188.
Assymetry	198.
Magazines for the People	205.
Class or Classes	209.
Class and Sex	211.
Notes	226.

Civilisation and Progress

We shall attempt to trace some major trends in theory and attitudes in the context of what has been described as "the problem of social change." [J.W. Burrow, 1966, p.276] The problems posed and discussed deserve more space than we can give them here, but it is hoped that the ideas included will help to explain the issues and examples developed in the following chapters.

According to Norbert Elias, [2 Vols., 1978 & 1982], the concept of being civilised sums up the self consciousness of the West which, for the last two or three hundred years:

Believes itself superior to earlier societies or more primitive to contemporary ones. By this term Western society seeks to describe what constituted its special character and what it is proud of; the level of *its* technology, the nature of *its* manners, the development of *its* scientific knowledge or view of the world, and much more." ¹
[Vol. 1, p.4]

Civilisation is at one and the same time a state of society and can refer to particular individuals or sections of that society. As Elias says, "There is almost nothing which cannot be done in a 'civilised' or an 'uncivilised' way." . It is a concept which is based^{on} common experiences and history and one which will never "become fully alive" for those "who do not speak from the same tradition and the same situation." Moreover it is accepted by the child who "learns to see the world through the lens of these concepts."²

Civilisation is also a concept of those countries with a national identity, sure of their borders and who have colonised abroad. Elias describes how Germany's particular history colours its view of civilisation. The middle class intelligentsia, from the 18th Century onwards, rejected French, the courtly language and in doing so, they emphasised achievement and virtue rather than birth. Many novels of the second half of the 18th Century deal with the fascination yet rejection of court life by the middle classes, (eg, Sophie de la Roche, Goethe. Elias, 1978, p23 & p25). Civilisation becomes equated with French courtliness and later, with the rise of the middle classes and the unification of Germany, the qualities of Kultur (akin to civilisation) and honesty and sincerity as opposed to 'pretty manners, become a "German characteristic." Moreover:

The sociogenesis and psychogenesis of human behaviour are still largely unknown, Even to raise the question may seem odd, It is nevertheless, observable that people from different social units behave differently in quite specific ways, We are accustomed to take this for granted, We speak of the peasant or the courtier, of the medieval man or the man of the twentieth century and we mean the people of the social units indicated by such concepts behave uniformly in a ... manner which transcends all individual differences, when measured against the individuals of a contrasting group ... no matter how much else they may have in common as human beings,

(Elias, 1978, p31) .

Elias is at pains to describe the civilising process not as a mathematical idea, but as history and is aware of the place of 20th Century Western people in it. He quotes from writers like Erasmus and their strictures on seemly behaviour, including farting, blowing one's nose and so on, and believes these symptoms of the civilising process bring us close to an understanding of "the actual change of behavior[sic] that took place in the West." Yet, it is embarrassing for us to

discuss these things and we often judge as 'barbaric' or uncivilised, those who are more open regarding bodily functions. That is why we judge previous and different standards of repugnance as uncivilised and it is valuable to be aware of our own embarrassments:

In reality, our terms "civilised" and "uncivilised" do not constitute an antithesis of the kind that exists between "good" and "bad", but represents stages in a development which, moreover, is still continuing. It might well happen that our stage of civilisation, our behavior, will arouse in our descendants feelings of embarrassment similar to those we sometimes feel concerning the behavior of our ancestors.

(Elias, 1978, p59)

Civilisation is a process in which we are involved and which appears, generally, "ready made." Elias does not wish to judge previous behaviours and sees the impossibility of discovering the "beginning" of the civilising process. He wishes to understand rather; "It was (medieval behaviour) a different standard from our own - whether better or worse is not here at issue." These ideas, as we shall see later, have a bearing on class attitudes and moralities and ideas about civilisation.

The link between civilisation and history is the mainspring of ideas of progress. Many writers look at the past and delineate movement and developments. Charles A. Beard, for example, saw an "age of despotism, an age of reason, and an age of democracy." [Introduction to J.B. Bury, 1955]

Interpretations of the way movement occurs and its manifestations informed political and social theory in the nineteenth century. As Beard said, "the idea of progress is both an interpretation of history and a philosophy of action" and is movement, however it is interpreted. Like himself "defenders of progress must assume that on the whole it is in a desirable direction," whether Christian or Marxist. For Bury, too,

progress was, per se, a movement in a desirable direction and anything moving in an "undesirable direct" could not be progress. Linked to "man's knowledge of his environment" progress may hit impossible barriers and therefore, a belief of progress, which, by definition, includes the future, is "an act of faith." Or, as Beard says, "The idea of progress as a way of thinking seems established beyond question, unless ... the historical chain of ages should be suddenly broken by strange interpositions utterly beyond all human experience." (Is he thinking of invasion from outer space or all-out nuclear war? Bury, 1955, pXXIX)

Bury (1955) gives an account of "the chain of ages"; the recorded history of civilisation covers 6000 years; the Greeks had an idea that man progressed from savage to civilised; the Middle Ages saw history as a series of events ordered by God; the sixteenth century saw progress as an idea which projected into the future. The nineteenth century is, however, a time of special significance in terms of new technology and scientific theory. According to Bury, it was brought home to the 'average man' that man could increase his power over nature indefinitely, and he points to the 1850's as the time when the idea of Progress was generally accepted. Although a belief in progress had pre-existed the nineteenth century, it was then that the search began for a scientific rule or law to establish it. It is interesting that Bury devotes a short chapter to Material Progress: The Exhibition of 1851. (Bury, 1955, p324-333) He sees the Exhibition as a statement of the belief in progress. Steam, gas, rail, machinery and the division of labour, proved mature forces in civilisation. Although, as Bury says, Prince Albert's speech at the opening ceremony stressed the unity of man, it was a concept that could also be used to stress the differences of

man, as we shall soon see. For Bury, to believe in progress, as seen now and for the future, was to be an optimist. He sets this against the exploitation of workers and new methods of warfare, but decides that "so far the hopes of 1851 have been fulfilled ... Yet in spite of all adverse facts and many eminent dissenters the belief in social progress has, on the whole, prevailed." (Bury, 1955, p332-333)

Evolutionary Theory

To find out some reasons why this should be, it is necessary to look at some of the ideas of the nineteenth century concerning progress, civilisation and evolution. The latter, cuts across the social theorists of the two halves of the century. What emerges, in the second half of the century, is an approach purported to be more scientific than the utilitarian beliefs of previous years, a reassessment of philosophical radicalism. J.W. Burrow (1966) discusses the difficulties inherent in Benthamite theory, in that it wishes both to be pragmatic and scientific. He says that Bentham's work on the law and universals, ('Influence of Time and Place'), in which Bentham believes that the legislator, when in command of all the facts, can make laws in any country, suggests that any country is the same as another. Burrow sums it up: "apart from all their distinguishing characteristics, all objects whatever are alike." Bentham was also not much concerned about history because it was now that reform was necessary. Burrow notes a desire apparent amongst intellectuals in the 1840's and 1850's for reassurance, "for guarantees that all was, ultimately at least, well with

the human situation ... " and a need to reassess philosophical radicalism in order to reformulate the purpose of life. This was to find succour in, and inspiration from, Darwin's work, (published in 1859):

Evolutionary theory arose, not only from a desire to emulate in the study of society the achievements of biology, geology and philology, but as a reaction against the collapse of systematic utilitarians, and the weakening of traditional religious belief,

(Burrows notes how those most prepared to take on evolutionary theory and sometimes to become atheists, were mainly from non-conformist backgrounds, for example, Henry Spencer. Burrows, 1966, p97)

According to one writer, *The Origin of Species* ensured "The established reign of the idea of Progress" (Bury, 1955 p335) because it had degraded man and given him a "humble pedigree." But, by showing that social life obeyed evolutionary laws and adaptations led to improvement the prognosis was an optimistic one.

One writer, amongst others, (including Spencer, J.S. Mill and numerous "anthropologists") who took these ideas on board, was Walter Bagehot. Both Darwin and Bagehot "agree ... that the Englishman of the mid-Victorian period was the fittest to survive." (Martha Westwater, 1983, pp.9-13) Indeed, it was part of an inevitable "eternal process" which was ongoing, slow and natural and any transformation in society would take generations. For Bagehot, the application of natural selection to human history gave the latter a sort of scientific validation and, moreover, a validation of his own conservative ideas. All men were not equal and, therefore, only those fit to do so should rule. (Bagehot believed in a centralised state as the safeguard of civilised society, but he was against the '67 Reform Bill because he thought the working class were ignorant and unintelligent. Their transformation would take generations. Westwater, 1983, p10-II)

Bagehot also applied these ideas to political economy. Slavery, for example, had proved in Ancient Greece and more recently in America, to be frail. It prevents movement of labour and causes resentment. Counterpoised to this is the 'free labourer' and "The organisation of slavery has never been as effectual as our present classified system of free labour ... "[W. Bagehot, 1885, p.61]

J.W. Burrows traces this development to the school of utilitarian thought before Darwin. It took James Mill eleven years to finish *The History of British India* [Pub.1817] and it represented, according to Burrows, a 'new denigration of alien cultures' so that "more than ever, contemporary Europe was being taken as the measure of all excellence." [1966, p.43] It is very much about the stage of civilisation reached by the Indians, but without some of the 18th Century willingness to learn from, for example, Hindu wisdom. [.. Burrows cites Sir William Jones, orientalist, who approved of customary law, Burrows, 1966, p⁴⁴)

According to Mill, civilisation could be marked on a scale of degrees related to utility and societies represented in India had been stationary for 'many ages' so that we converse with *ancient* Hindus when we talk to one today. As Burrow points out, there are numerous examples of a growing arrogance in the 19th Century. Macaulay, he says, was contemptuous of ethnology and his recommendation that oriental literature should fall into neglect was 'largely accepted,' Macaulay, however, did place the "Hindoos" above the savages in America who were conquered by Cortes. These savages had no letters, could not use metal, 'had not broken a single animal to labour, who wielded no better weapons than those which could be made out of sticks, flints, and fishbones, who regarded a horse-soldier as a monster, half man and half beast ...

"[Macaulay, 1902, p.502] Bemoaning the fact that 'Every schoolboy' knows about Montezuma and not about the 'joy and triumph' over India, he says: "The people of India when we subdued them, were ten times as numerous as the Americans whom the Spaniards vanquished and were at the same time quite as highly civilised as the victorious Spaniards.' Indeed, Macaulay spent his leisure time in India reading the classics.[Burrows, 1966, p.51] Most of the administration and higher military in India came from "the sons of English country gentlemen whom the industrial revolution had passed by." [A. Jacob, 1972, p.63] Many had fallen on stricken times, or were from a large family. Some, like Bartle Frere, were sons of politicians. Jacob quotes Shaw, who said 'The British Empire was a system of outdoor relief for the middle classes.' By 1866, however, the *Saturday Review* is saying that it is the City which is "another branch of that system of relief for the aristocracy which Mr. Bright denounces." [See W.D. Rubinstein, 1977, pp.114-115] But the East India Company, for example, never lost its 'mystique' and it was still acceptable in society. (Both James and J.S. Mill were in the East India Company, for example.) John Jacob, [1812-58], was one of eight boys from his and his brothers own family to go to India. He is interesting because of his materialist philosophy. In his early years in India, he commented on Indian soldiers: "Even with the poor Asiatic something may be done in this way ... The more we can raise our subordinates in the scale of rational beings, the more we can command them." [Jacob, 1972, p.65 - He gives no precise references.] Here are echoes of J.A. Roebuck's stated intention of elevating the working man to "Be like me" and, that better educated, is better subjected. Moreover, he said "It is only because the European officer is a superior being to the Asiatic by nature, that we hold India

"... I think her (Britain's) nobler capacity is what I may call her imperial character, in which, as from the throne of heaven, she superintends all the several inferior legislatures, and guides and controls without annihilating any." There can be little doubt that it is upon the degree of fidelity with which the mother country fulfils these duties towards her dependencies, that her tenure of them rests. The empire of Great Britain is one which, having its beginning in the fact of military superiority, finds the elements of its growth and strength in the idea of moral service to mankind ... the empire of England alone is based upon freedom and liberty."

(Burke's religious eulogy is reminiscent of *The Times*' description of Queen Victoria at the opening ceremony of the Great Exhibition, Escott, 1885, p582-3)

In discussing self-government for the colonies, Escott notes that those that have it "bear the stamp of the English prototype," but that in general it is a problem. We quote what he says in full because it is referring to 'coloureds', but it was an attitude shown towards working class people too:

How far the franchise and other constitutional privileges should be given to the indigenous masses of coloured citizens in such colonies as Natal, The Cape, Tasmania and the Straits Settlements, is a question constantly being presented for solution to practical politicians. It may be scarcely realised with how free a hand the power of voting has been conceded to the coloured population of such a colony as the Cape; but a danger may be created for the State if by a process of philanthropic but anticipatory legislation, the full rights of citizenship are given before they are deserved.

(Escott, 1885, p578)

Burrow sees a general development from 18th Century interest in other cultures to 19th Century cultural chauvinism, but finds it hard to explain why the shift occurs. One explanation could be, he says, in the 18th Century, the traditional customs of agricultural communities were not altogether beyond the experience of the upper classes and it was not until the 19th Century that attitudes changed dramatically. As we shall see later, by the mid-19th Century, traditional wakes, fairs and sports were considered as a waste of time, encouraging improvidence and

In Alaric Jacob's view, the Bayards put *in* more than they got *out* of India and bequeathed them English Law and language. Some stayed so long that England was, for them, the alien land. But, he says, it is our language "through which the Indian peoples have access to a world, encircling culture and technology and to the richest of all living literatures" which is our real achievement. In other words, we took our "civilising" influence with us and helped progress in India. Escott describes how a new colonist will find his fellow countrymen "have only changed their place of abode, not their real character" and how he believes that the British Empire was built up by "individual Englishmen who have left the indelible stamp of the mother country upon its laws, customs and society." (Escott, 1885, p. 572) They play cricket, football, rowing and they sometimes compete with colonial competitors proving that they can 'hold their ground against the champions of a population ten times greater than their own.' Escott gives the impression that the colonists are hardy and competitive, indeed, they embody the ideals of political economy. He says 'The colonists represent the people who have had the energy and courage to try to ameliorate their position - they represent, in other words, what a Darwinian would describe as the survival of the fittest,' and although there are the 'old families,' to have risen by personal industry and perseverance is no bar to the attainment of the highest social position.' In addition "Professional men and merchants ... are held in great esteem". One of the most general justifications for Empire, given by Escott, is the moral influence of Britain which, he says, is based on military force. He quotes from what Burke had said in a speech on American taxation:

at all." Jacob comments on fears about Russian aggression, believing that India would stay in British hands if men behaved as "English Gentlemen." In a statement reminiscent of Spencer or Bagehot, he says:

If Russia bring with her a better civilisation and a higher moral tone; if she introduce European honesty, ideas ... into Asia - the better for us. All that needs to good must ultimately be to the advantage of free England. But can Russia do this? Can she make known to clever Asiatics a better, nobler and higher moral power than they are now acquainted with? I much doubt this."
(Jacob, 1972, p66)

Notice the word 'clever' - the Indians must, of course, be discerning enough to recognise the benefits of English rule. Notice too, above, that Macaulay plays up the strength and splendour of the Indians when describing their defeat.

Like Spencer and Bagehot, Jacob is ascribing to the rationale that adaptation is easy and desirable when it is good. He was not a Christian, his brother called him an 'infidel' and he wrote a book called *Letters to a Lady on the Progress of Being* in which he attacked Christianity "with support for a materialist philosophy based on a theory of evolution that anticipated Darwin." In this, he wrote "The same laws affect all." Burrow describes how Spencer was comforted by the idea of progress and Jacob may have been. What is known, is his rigid belief in the English Gentleman "with standards that would have seemed Utopian at the Court of King Arthur." Indeed:

The gentleman may have been, as Bertrand Russell remarked, a concept invented by the nobility to keep the middle classes in order, but he kept the entire Indian sub-continent in order from Jacobs time at least until E.M. Forster's, when the word Sahib became a joke in the dying music hall and old Indian civilians could be heard complaining that the suburban villa had supplanted the country house as the breeding place of India's rulers,
(Jacob, 1972, p67)

uncivilised behaviour. It would appear that views on what was considered appropriate as a pastime and indeed the nature of the agricultural and urban working classes, were linked to ideas of civilisation or what constituted 'being civilised' and ideas about other races. Moreover, Bentham's idea of 'universal legislation' which facilitated state action, for example, on health and later, education, were part of the 'philosophy of action' of reform and improving. It has been pointed out, however, that the other side of the coin is a 'genuine humanitarianism'. [Burrow, 1966, p.53. See Introduction to this thesis about issues of drink, women and blood sports.]

The idea of the 'primitive' or Noble Savage as a sanitised ideal or "part of the furniture of a fete champetre" [Burrow, 1966, p.5] and as a symbol of innocence came from ideas before the 19th Century. "Men of the eighteenth century ... were prepared to believe in the wisdom and virtue of savages, if the savages would only cooperate," but this idea was only slightly, if at all, based on real knowledge of "primitive" societies.⁴

Just as it is impossible to read most nineteenth century social inquiry reports without seeing some element of judgement about civilised behaviour, so it is with the writing of anthropologists. In his 'The Origin of Civilisation' [1870], Lubbock says:

The study of the lower races of men, apart from the direct importance which it possesses in an empire like ours, is of great interest ... In the first place, the conditions and habits of existing savages resemble in many ways, though not in all, those of our own ancestors ... we can even penetrate some of that mist which separates the present from the future.
[p.1 From Burrow, 1966, p.229-3]

What comes out of looking at nineteenth century anthropological writings is, that whether writers emphasised the unity or the differences of

"mankind", the underlying idea is of US and THEM. Savage is inferior within the idea of progress and barbaric within the idea of civilisation.⁵ Many of the writers were optimists about the future changes in society and it is the application of scientific theory to ideas about society that Bury identifies as the location of that optimism. As Tylor said 'The science of culture is essentially a reformer's science'[from *Primitive Culture* 11, p.140. 1871 in Burrow, 1966, p.254] Burrow himself says that social evolutionist theory gave Victorians an intellectual resting place where the tension between the need for certainty and the need to obtain more and diverse social facts and interpret them, came together.

It is also important to see it as the result of an attempt to come to terms with new social and economic conditions and is thus part of the social policy debate. By the mid-century (and pre-dating *The Origin of Species*) radicals were calling for historical understanding versus a priori theorizing. J.S. Mill, for example, could comfort himself that his values were not prejudices when viewed through a theory of progress. Each state in progress had different institutions and the task of political theory was to work out the principles from which correct institutions for a given society may be created. In fact, people like Lubbock and Spencer often used utilitarian arguments in order to justify social evolutionary theory.⁶ Also, in common with the utilitarians, the philosophical radicals believed that growth in understanding between classes, had to be based on some form of common ground or class contact. This idea persisted in many forms throughout the century, as we shall later see, (for example, working men's clubs) and included popular progress magazines.

There were many other aspects to what Elias calls the 'civilising process', which were moving and changing as a result of shifts of power

in the nineteenth century. This process, which he describes from feudalism to capitalism, led to changes in behaviour signalling a growth in 'civilising' and 'civilised' habits. The first major change occurred in the shift to absolute Princes and Kings and their courts. The increasing centralization of power seemed to bring with it greater restraints in aggression and daily ritual. There were greater nuances of rank and vying for the ruler's favour entailed self-discipline.⁷ The process continues:

The "civilisation" which we are accustomed to regard as a possession that comes to us, apparently ready-made, without our asking how we actually came to possess it is a process or part of a process in which we are ourselves involved. Every particular characteristic that we attribute to it - machinery, scientific discovery, forms of state, or whatever else - bears witness to a particular structure of human relations to a particular social structure, and to the corresponding form of behaviour.

[Elias, 1978, Vol. 1 p.59]

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, however, Elias says there is a tendency for "affect expressions [to] gravitate towards the middle line"[Vol.2 p.238]. When the State becomes a place where there is no longer constant feuding and violence and the acquisition of money and status become the main goals, constraints on behaviour are generally becoming more indirect. In the centralised state, "a continuous uniform pressure is exerted on individual life by the physical violence stored behind the scenes of everyday life, a pressure totally familiar and hardly perceived."[Elias, Vol.2, p.239] In the nineteenth century, also, work more than ever becomes something most people are expected to do, (think now about how one of the well worn justifications of our monarchy is that they work harder than most people in this country) and Elias talks about how the wealthy go on working under the pressure of competition and prestige. Status gives their lives meaning and work is

another 'self-restraint.'(see Elias Vol.2, p.252. Weber also deals with the "spirit of modern economic life and the rational ethics of Protestantism", *The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism*, 1965).^e

Assymetry

Elias describes changes in restraint as modifications of existing behaviour in various directions. It is generally assumed that these changes occur and filter 'downwards' through the upper to middle and working classes, [Elias, Vol.2, p.249] However, there is some evidence to prove that this is not always the case. T.H.S. Escott describes both mill owners and the mill hands. The latter, in Manchester, have "little superficial polish," they have pride, are blunt, well-read and kindly and "their dialect is uncouth, but they take pride in it ... " They are compared to Black people with a very open sort of denigrating arrogance. Describing their clog dance, Escott says - "It is, in fact, the negro tom-tom dance without the savage exuberance. For it is a necessity that, though the average intelligence is high, there must be, among the stunted produce of early marriages, a certain amount of congenital imbecility." [Escott, 1885, p.81] Again, he compares working class people at the race course to Black people in the United States, in New Orleans on a Sunday, "... Where the coloured pedestrians monopolise the pavement to the entire exclusion of the shrinking whites." This colonial/racist attitude towards working class people is both linguistic and an ideological trend throughout much of the century and notwithstanding

feelings of humanitarianism it informed policies and decisions and fears about working class people. As for the wealthy:

It would be a mistake to suppose that the only type of the prosperous manufacturer is that of the showy and luxurious plutocrat, with his picture galleries, his well stocked cellars, his graperies, his conservatories and their precious contents ... There is an old proverb in Lancashire - "Four generations from clog to clog."
[Escott, 1885, p.76]

This passing down of wealth (through the male line) "clog to clog", shows a desire by the provincial manufacturer to express his "roots" and a certain "sameness" with his employees. "It is a marked peculiarity of the Lancashire mill-owner, educated and travelled though he be, to affect a certain humility or homeliness in his native place." [p.88] He allows his hands, who he knows by name, to call him "John", extending to his workers the respect due to the "employed." Escott says that this "freedom" on the part of mill-hands, affects their leisure and makes them "bear a disagreeably close likeness to the London rough." In business:

The art connoisseur of Manchester - his cultivation often no mere pretence - will in business affect the Lancashire patois; will answer his neighbour when a bargain is being struck, "I'd loike to, but I canna do't." This has probably given rise to the proverbial saying, "Liverpool gentlemen and Manchester men."
(Escott, 1885, p.88)

This was one way of dealing with inter-class contacts and relations. It is also interesting how 'the art connoisseur of Manchester' uses local patois for business transactions. It was equated with qualities of bluntness, etc., indeed, with those qualities Escott attributes to working class people. In his account of the greetings between worker and master, Escott is also describing a sort of common meeting ground between men who are not appearing to acknowledge status differences.³ (It would be

interesting to find out if women workers called the boss by his first name.)

It was a way of relating to a lower class by identification of individuals. Each side may still be aware of status differences and yet communicate. There may be a tendency to approach the 'middle line' that Elias talks about. In 'Scenes of Clerical Life' (see note 9), George Eliot's description of the Vicar and parishioners shows how Mr. Gilfil adjusts his behaviour to them and they to him. The latter act more 'proper' and mind "their words."

Elias discusses the tendency for upper classes to reduce differences while also maintaining distinctions. He describes this "double tendency" using the "expansion of Western civilisation" as an illustration. Here, the colonizer from the West, attempts to create his own standards in the colonies and yet by making large areas of the world dependent on him, he himself becomes dependent on those he has colonized. "Superiority" and "inferiority" are qualities delineated by differentiation. As his culture and standards spread, however, contrasts are reduced, but also maintained, by ever greater nuances of social conduct.[See Vol.2, p.255] Behaviour models for the middle classes are, he says, the upper class (as illustrated in Moliere's 'Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme'), until finally a greater similarity of standards occur which prompts the aristocracy to emphasise "good breeding" and a notion of good society that goes beyond money and resources. G. Stedman-Jones, [1983, p.185] mentions how, despite social distinctions, that as far as the middle class masters and journeymen of the eighteenth century were concerned, distinctions of trade were more important and that political differences began when artisans started to organise themselves in Trade Unions and form an ideology of

their own. Gambling, theatre, pugilism and animal sports, were also shared by men of all classes, but "In the period 1790-1840, the distance between the London middle class and those beneath them increased dramatically." Stedman-Jones lists some of the reasons as propertied classes turning to evangelicalism; Benthamism, support for political economy, The Reform Bill and The Poor Law.[See also Rubinstein, 1977, pp.117-61.

Interestingly, in the middle of the century, Bagehot says that "the aristocracy live in fear of the middle class." [Asa Briggs, 1956, p.72] The following event shows how the middle classes were becoming more assured of their positions socially and although there is a sense in which they are treading carefully and expressing deference, there is also confidence. In 1851, during the Great Exhibition, there was a renewed interest in London entertainments including monuments and art galleries. The *Illustrated London News* of August 23rd carried an article about visitors to the Duke of Northumberland's house in The Strand. It rejoices in the lowering of social barriers between the aristocracy and the middle classes. (The journalist would have been middle class and the illustrations depict middle class visitors. The text also addresses an audience supposed to be well versed in the beauty of a Raphael etc. The paper, founded in 1842, generally included court news and detailed articles about royal balls, dress, food and so forth, with many illustrations, colonial news too. At 6d, it was not among the cheaper papers which were "to many people synonymous" with "radical." [Altick, 1957, p.349] Altick's figures for circulation [p.394] show its popularity rose after the Exhibition which dominated its issues over that period. In 1850, it sold 67,000 and 1854-5 , 123,000. In 1885, Escott,[p.567-80] comments prophetically, on illustrated weekly papers saying that

notwithstanding their success, "it may be that in England the newspaper of the future has yet to come into being." It would revert to commenting on the news "in the briefest and pithiest way, [and] would command a large success.")

One of the most gratifying and hopeful signs of our time is a disposition beginning to manifest itself in high quarters to relax that habitual reserve and to qualify that cold exclusiveness in which our aristocracy have too long indulged as an hereditary principle, and to extend civilities to a larger world, with whom in former days they were taught to think they could have no reciprocity of sympathies. Another gratifying sign of an age advancing in civilisation - civilisation of the noblest and most useful kind based upon extended knowledge and good feeling is the manner in which these favours are received and improved by the public,
[I.L.N. 23/8/51]

The lowering of class "exclusiveness" is expressed as an advance in civilisation based on utilitarian principle. Speaking from a middle class standpoint, the article praises Education for creating "enlarged feelings of self-respect" and lessening of prejudice. Once considered "Goths" and "Vandals" we are now no longer seen as "habitual defacers of monuments and public works," and "misgivings about the fruits of the tree of knowledge have been cast to the wind." It is interesting to see how the "we" appears to include both the working and middle classes as opposed to the aristocracy. It describes Northumberland House (as if it were a sort of sacred shrine) as:

One of the oldest and most interesting of the penetralia of our aristocracy, belonging to one of the proudest and most exclusive of that aristocracy, but which, with the most kindly and generous feeling on the part of the present noble possessor, has for some months been thrown open to the public in aid of the great and good objects of the international congress of 1851,
(I.L.N. 23/8/51)

According to the paper, there were 10-11,000 visitors on average, per week, and it was open three days a week.¹⁰

These comments, which also go on to advocate other nobles to follow suit in order to "instruct" their "humbler neighbours", not only show an antagonism within the middle classes themselves, (they are both deferential and almost critical at the same time), but also mirror middle class ideas about their responsibilities towards the working classes. There was a mutual dependency here (as we shall see later), which appears to follow Elias's concept of the nature of colonising countries and their relation to the colonised.

In his five-tier class structure, Neale divides the middle and working classes each into two parts; middle class and middling class; and working classes A and B. [See R.S. Neale, 1972, pp.15ff] The middling class consisted of petit bourgeois and professionals and working class A were artisans, with B as operatives and labourers.¹¹ The middling class were hostile. Many of the radical political reformers came from the literate and professional strata of this group. Neale describes how they felt a difference between themselves and more propertied middle class men. Rubinstein [1977, p.116-7], also points out the differences between the London and provincial middle class. Those based in London were considered more "gentlemanly" and later were to have many aristocratic connections. This was contrasted with the work of the "captains of industry". The London based reforming intellectuals were, he says, louder than the richer elite, but "their writings reflect a curious lack of depth and realism about factory poverty."¹² . He also contrasts this with Manchester Liberalism, see n.54]

The philosophic radicals included men from the provinces and London and Neale calls them those "uneasy men" who, on the whole, lacked money, but who had aspirations. They ranged from Sir William Molesworth who could donate £4,000 to support The London Review, to J.S. Mill on £1,200 p.a., H.S. Chapman on £260 p.a., Francis Place, 'a successful breeches-maker' and Roebuck, a barrister. "On occasion they touched shoulders with deviant aristocrats like Lords Durham and Brougham." [Neale, 1972, p.25] Some were M.P.'s (Roebuck and Grote for example), who had support from tradesmen, artisans and some military and professional men. Their platform (which they put out in a series of Pamphlets for the People at 1½d, 1835-6) included occupier suffrage, abolition of the property qualification, the ballot, equal electoral districts, abolition of the newspaper stamp, national education, law reform, municipal reform and:

The social class to which these views appealed was made up of those who were low in the traditional scale of status and privilege ... and those in this position who aspired to rise and could only do so through their own unaided efforts ... It mirrored that individuated, privatised and non-deferential social class consciousness which grew among a middling set of people in a ... changing society ...

Support included artisans as well as some professionals like doctors.

[Neale, 1972, p.26]

The philosophic radicals wanted to "elevate" the working man and to make him, as Roebuck said, "Like me." A brief look at one of the vehicles, they envisaged would help to achieve this (for example journals of popular progress) will highlight some of the issues involved. It is hoped the discussion in the following section will throw light on the difficulties of dialogue. The popular progress publications of the 1840's onwards, included *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine* and the London based *Howitt's*

and *The People's Journal*. The latter proclaimed its desire "to express a nation, and not a class ... "[Facsimile of page one, reproduced in Brian E. Maidment, 1984, p.83] Asa Briggs notes how the notion of "the people" thought of as the middle classes in the years just before and after 1832 was beginning to change so that by the 1840's it generally referred to the working classes.[Briggs, 1972, p.69] For James Mill, however, "the people" did not include women. Corrigan characterises earlier ideas of people like James Mill and those of the later radicals, as "the illiberality of Liberalism" because both were linked to the creation of "wider moral regulation." [P. Corrigan, 1980b p.293]

Magazines for the People

The People's Journal said it aimed to be an "efficient helpmate to the Working Man, by affording him full and timely information of what Philanthropists and Philanthropical Societies, of his and every other class, have done or are doing on his behalf." [Maidment, 1984, p.83] Subjects were to include Domestic Management, The garden, Care of Health, Household Education and descriptions of "The New Book that he would like to read, or the New Play, New Actor, or New Exhibition that he would probably like to see." (Standards were judged by one class - it is not a situation that one can imagine being allowed in the reverse.) The 'Journal' proposed to create a cultural dialogue. (As opposed to 'The Penny Magazine' promoted by Brougham and The Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, SDUK or 'The Saturday Magazine' of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge - see Altick, 1957, p.352,332-9 and passim

- which aimed solely at giving knowledge and instructing to improve the working classes.)

The dialogue, however, was formulated and directed by the middle class staff and contributors. Maidment, in his article about this, wrestles with the problems of whether these type of magazines were "relatively progressive attempts to replace cultural propaganda with a more open form of cultural dialogue which was to exploit literature as a common ground for discussion "or" as part of a process of at least partially conscious middle class social control - an 'intervention' by, or on behalf of, the middle classes at a moment when working class readers might have to be diverted from political activism ... "[Maidment, 1984, p.87] He contends that it is more complicated than a straight dichotomy between two attitudes and that on a reading of these journals, class consciousness is something that can be negotiated between different groups. (Elias, perhaps, would describe it as a locus where the shift towards a "middle line" was being pushed.)

The journals purpose was, at the very least, to create the illusion of "cultural negotiation" and as with other issues such as drink, (see below Chapter 21, their controllers can be defended or criticised from different perspectives (here there could be control and participation.) If William Howitt could describe *Howitt's Journal* as a "moral steam engine," Emerson, (visiting Britain in 1847), could describe it as "a sugar plum thrown to a mad bull." [Maidment, 1984, p.88. From Carl Woodring's 'Victorian Samplers', Kansas, 1952, p.102. It is interesting to note that the SDUK was called the Steam Intellect Society by Peacock - see Asa Briggs, 1956, p.66 - attaching a machine metaphor to attempts at "popular progress."]'

What of the working class contributions to these journals? They consisted mainly of autobiographies and poetry and tended to be segregated from other contributions., Articles by Smiles, however, would be in the same journal as work by artisans. Generally, editors saw themselves as "patrons and cultural entrepreneurs of artisan literary values",[Maidment, 1984, p.90] but the main genre for "major issues favoured the literary traditions of middle class writing," for example, the prose of "reportage." Maidment says this difference sometimes pressurised artisans who contributed "to prove their literary competence, and [they] tended to choose ambitious literary forms rather than those more directly suited to their interests and subjects." (perhaps the literary equivalent of best clothes.)

Although there were local journals they were dominated by London and Edinburgh, which, according to Maidment, was partly due to the validation writers believed they got from them. This stunted local development. The example of two poems, written by working class men, illustrate the *uncertainties* about the position of the working class and their experiences and also the *certainities* the middle class felt about their position. One is 'Just Instinct and Brute Reason,' by "A Manchester Operative." [From *Howitt's Journal* 1, 6th March 1847, p.132 - Maidment, 1984, p.90]

It is described by Maidment as "a bitterly-felt metaphoric comparison between 'natural' forms of power and the 'unnatural' relationships set up within the industrial system." It combined "social indignation" and "social threat" in a five verse poem. The editorial response or "gloss" revealed "the limitations they placed on working class self expression." It acknowledged the writer's severity and the

cause as being his suffering ,but they emphasise that "he is a *poet*, and poets 'learn suffering' ...EDS." They address the writer as "Our operative" so they not only have put him in his place, but they have also ignored the validity or reality of his experiences. Unequal class relations are asserted but not acknowledged as Brian Maidment comments:

The editorial unease of these comments; reveals itself ostentatiously in the offensive, but assertive, "our" and "we". Evidently shaken by the authority of the poem's anger, the Howitt's felt the necessity of mediating the poems indignation into middle class awareness by attempting to strip it of its menace,
[1984, p.91]

The other poem Maidment focuses on is by a Glasgow worker called Robert West, who sent a poem to 'Tait's' in 1840 asking them to publish it "If you think ... the verses good enough ... "

The editorial response exemplifies all the inequalities of the magazine's discourse; "If our correspondent means 'good enough' merely as poetry, we should say 'No', but if 'good enough' in another sense, the publication of the Spinner's verses are sufficient answer, They are good enough as one more feather thrown up to show how the wind sets,"
[From Tait's VII, 1840, p.518]

This running of the gauntlet must have been, says Maidment, very discouraging to "those writers who had invested ... their cultural and social energy in the acquirement of some rudiments of literary skill." Signs of class allegiance made the editors uneasy and in the end the journals were merely a "rhetorical construction." (Maidment, 1984, p93)

Class or Classes

We have already mentioned a point made by Rubinstein about how the London philosophic radical knew little about northern working class realities and Neale notes how there were differences between, for example, the 'factoryised' proletariat and local artisans such as were found in a place like Bath. For many philosophic radicals who included the artisan in their definition of 'the people' the latter was a literate, respectable and rational construction:

Indeed because of the insistence of Philosophic Radicals on the need for education and enlightenment it seems very likely that their image of 'the people' was dominated by their own self-image and by their image of the industrious and literate workman and shopkeeper; by their image of a middling class,
[Neale, 1972, p.27]

It was a concept that did not include what they considered 'the mob or the masses' but its character was that of the masses after they had been transformed. Neale attempts to explain what he sees as an element of fluidity between certain classes in terms of a separation of concepts of social stratification and social class. Social stratification includes "measurable" criteria such as income and education, but also language and values. "Social classes, however, are really conflict groups arising out of the authority structure of imperatively coordinated associations." Using Ginsberg and Dahrendorf's idea of quasi-groups. (These are "recruiting fields for classes" and are based on a recognition of interests vis-a-vis other social classes. Based on his idea that these can become social classes (dependent on "technical, political and social conditions" and "relationships of authority and subjection as felt ... in a

quasi-group") he sees a recognition of interests between artisans and some of the middle classes (middling). There are problems, however, with this analysis. If, for example, two social classes recognise interests, this can only be partial and on differing levels. (Neale does, however, say that whether quasi-groups become social classes depends on structures of authority.) As we have seen, attempts to level out class differences were conducted in the sphere of literary interests, but it was on ground which was the territory of and controlled by middle class people. Wanting to lift people "up" to their level and create a new concept of "the people" which denied the experiences of class (and in doing so acknowledged it) could only ultimately reinforce differences. Neale's separation of social stratification and social class is only useful, perhaps, in terms of explaining that some people from different classes felt, despite economic status etc., that they had certain things in common. Social stratification is determined by factors mentioned above and social classes are conflict groups, but the concept of quasi-groups cannot explain all alliances. Women may come together to fight on specific issues, but they are not a social class and social differences (which may be problematical) are not necessarily altered. Indeed, if quasi-groups are recruiting fields for classes, they are not classes either. The concept of the quasi-group does not seem to put equal emphasis on *differences* as well as similarities and it is precisely these differences based on class (or, as Neale would say, social class and stratification) which underpin the failures of such attempts as the journals of popular progress.

There are, however, identifiable groups in society, which, to some extent, cut across class boundaries, but which are coloured differently in between each boundary they cross and at different times, depending on

circumstances and practices in certain areas; for example, leisure, work, and sexuality. The following is a discussion of class and sexuality which illustrates some of the arguments described above.

Class and Sex

The debate in recent years about middle class sexuality in the 19th Century, has thrown up some interesting points about the relationship between the state, ideology and historical development. The arguments of Peter Cominos ('Late Victorian Sexual Respectability and the Social System' in *International Review of Social History* 8) and Steven Marcus (*The Other Victorians* 1966) have been criticised by R.S. Neale[1972] and Rachel Harrison and Frank Mort, [P. Corrigan, 1980^a) in their chapter 'Patriarchal Aspects of Nineteenth Century State Formation: Property Relations, Marriage and Divorce and Sexuality, pp.79-109]

According to Neale, Marcus and Caminos pose too rigid a view of middle class morality and he suggests (based on his five tier class model) that the middle classes were less 'ideologically homogeneous' than Marcus and Caminos believe. They both put forward the thesis that sexual mores, practices and sexual identity are 'functionally integrated' into economic structures of society. Looked at from Elias' view, that the 19th Century saw ever greater "civilising" or control of the affects or natural impulses, it can be agreed with both writers that the prevailing middle class ideology was that 'sensual man was the enemy of civilised man.' [Neale, 1972, p.121] Neale, however, believes that Cominos' parallel between 'thrift in semen' and 'thrift in capital' is not only too direct a

relationship, but that it is also incorrect. Rather than a response to 'thrift', Neale sees the 'norm of sexual continence' in the middle classes, as the result of desires for *consumption* and concern regarding status. Malthus, for example, addressed the middling class, who, like himself, saw their standards of living as precarious, the growth in the size of families and the possibility that growth in manufacturing industry was not infinite. Both Malthus and H.S. Chapman¹² were concerned with the worries many middle class men felt about being able to marry and not fall into a lower class due to economic pressures. Moreover, the philosophic radicals, who supported systematic colonisation, could see how many professions open to 'the ten pound electors' (civil and military) were becoming crowded.¹³ Similar to Malthus, Chapman saw the dangers of celibacy based on these fears, as prostitution and the 'double standard'. Elias, [Vol.1, p.174-5] mentions Erasmus' *Colloquies* intended for school boys and later 19th criticisms of it for its sexual frankness. The book was based on the idea of "introducing the boy to life." Elias does not mention that girls were not sent to school and refers to the boys as children, but he does include both in his discussion of a 19th Century book intended to help parents deal with questions about sex. The basic approach was one of preserving children's innocence. But there was still a greater leniency towards male sexual "transgression."

Harrison and Mort, [Corrigan, 1980a, p.94-95] say that the basis for this was to do with inheritance and "more specifically, though the use of divorce procedure usually expressed the husband's concern that the wife's adultery allowed for the possibility of implanting illegitimate offspring in a legitimate aristocratic family." But in a debate over the 1857 Matrimonial Causes Act in the House of Lords, the idea of implanting a

"cuckoo in the nest" was not just an aristocratic concern. Brian Harrison discusses the differences in working class and middle class moralities in the terms of greater control of their private sphere by the middle classes.[1983, p.70] The social inquiries showed the lack of privacy in working class homes. In middle class terms, (Harrison believes), this led to differences in attitudes with the working classes having more illegitimacies but rarer divorces, (see discussion of this above). That the middle classes had greater privacy, was a result of greater space due to higher wealth and this is reflected in their behaviour. As Elias says, the rules of socially acceptable behaviour expresses the self-image of a class.[Vol.1, p.59] Pearsall [1969], calls this the 'double think' between family and "norms" and guilt and prostitution. (He believes guilt pervaded most sexual relationships - 'sexual intercourse was a deed of darkness') We have, however, already seen Neale's view on this through the 'minority ideology' of the radicals. He also discusses publications about contraception and middle class use of it, which seems to have been a middle way between the 'continence' and 'incontinence', [Pearsall,1969, p126-7)

Elias discusses changes in attitudes towards sex in a very much more general way in comparing shifts over the centuries. Despite some limitations, he offers examples to show the differences between popular writings for school boys by Erasmus in the 16th Century and 19th Century attitudes which castigated the sexual allusions thought perfectly acceptable in the earlier centuries.[Vol.1, p.170] The 'conspiracy of silence' characterising sexual matters and also the discussion of them between adults and children, is, Elias contends, a relatively recent occurrence. This is due amongst other things, to the shift in the notion

of children and childhood with a gradual exclusion of children from 'adult society.' Elias also sees a shift towards greater privacy with the contradictions of prevailing ideas and former 'open' discourse being moved to a position 'behind the scenes.' Prostitutes, although lowly and despised, were more "public" than in the nineteenth century. (Vol.1, p.176-7) These shifts also affected the marriage customs, for example bedroom rituals involving relatives are gradually phased out. The process of concealment was seen in the increasing frivolity of courtlife.

The problems with the approach of Marcus are firstly that:

A simple notion of sexual repression often also implies an 'essential' sexuality which, though it is denied access and visibility, is basically taken as pre-given. What such a position fails to consider is the fact that particular sexualities (for example, notions of sexual difference and sexual 'deviance') are *constructed* within specific practices such as the law, literature or medicine, [Ed, Corrigan, 1980 ap, 104]

Marcus agrees with Elias that sexual openness diminished in the 18th and 19th centuries and that the sexual ideology was a continuance of previous developments. Marcus [quoted by Neale, 1972, p.123], says that 'the impulses and fantasies of pornography are transhistorical' and Elias discusses instincts and sexual drives in this way.¹⁴

Although Elias tries to interweave his "sociogenetic" and "psychogenetic" insights it is in the former that his writing is clearest historically. He does, however, also acknowledge that social power gives greater freedom to both sexes (Vol.1, p.183. He refers to greater sexual freedoms for aristocratic women in courtly circles] and the vast imbalance of power, male aggression and wife beating of Medieval society. Marcus, however, would avoid the wooliness of transhistoricity if he

integrated ideas about sexual imbalances of power at particular historical moments.¹⁵

One of the basic elements of this in the nineteenth century is the greater social freedom of all men, regardless of class, compared with that of women. For middle class women the home and male protection were *generally* the boundaries of movement, (there were notable exceptions however) and for working class women (with children, especially,) leisure time was restricted by the duties of the home. This idea is linked to political ideology and attitudes which have survived up to the present time, for example, the reluctance of the police to "intervene" in "domestic" violence when a husband is physically attacking his wife. As Anne Forman says:

Liberal thought, which provided the political framework for radicals in the nineteenth century, assumed that the realm of freedom was in the individuals private life, within the family. If men exercised their will freely in the public sphere they would collide with each others interests. Accordingly, the state should have the power to regulate activities in this sphere of the family. It was this separation of public life from the family, and the restriction of women to the latter which gave the freedom of the individual man its meaning.
[Foreman, 1977, p.11]

The working class man had more social time outside the home than working class women, but the greatest social domain was that of the middle and upperclass man who could also descend into the lower regions. Most prostitutes were women from the lower classes, but there were, according to Brian Harrison, also male prostitutes with many aristocratic customers.

The views of working class culture (and there were differences recognised, for example, between the "respectable" and "improvident")

changed throughout the century. The early social inquiries of the 1830's and 1840's and later, saw the working classes as uncivilised, (although Booth observed later that the working classes did have their "own" rules of propriety - see G. Stedman-Jones [1983, p.183]. Stedman-Jones says, they were said to be 'heathen', live in 'swamps' and be without 'civilisation'. There were also working class critics of workingclass recreations. One example, Charles Shaw, criticised the feast of 'St. Monday', which meant drinking and sexual 'debauchery'. What is often described as an informal form of resistance by the skilled who maintained some control over their rate of work often in the Potteries, oppressed the child "runners":

There was generally little if any, work done on Mondays and Tuesdays, and yet it was rare for any of the men to get on Saturday less than a full week's wage. From Wednesday to Saturday they worked themselves, and worked others, boys and women, like galley slaves. From four or five in the morning until nine and ten at night this fierce race for wages was run. There was no Factory Act then ... Women and children were given up to the greed of employers and to the drunken greed of many of their operative "masters" ...
[Charles Shaw, 1983, p.54]

Thus, when considering the complexity of class attitudes, (especially in relation to government and nineteenth century capitalism) it is important to bear in mind the relationship of both sex and age to wage labour.

Rachel Harrison and Frank Mort use the property and divorce laws and sexuality to examine the relationship of these things to legislative intervention and 'productive capitalism.' [Corrigan, 1980^a p.79] In discussing 'deviant' sexuality, they say that too many oversimplifications are made. (See also R.S. Neale, 1972, p.124, where he criticises how Marcus sees direct links between capitalism and sexual ideology both "normal" and "abnormal" sexuality.)

Much of the recent work on nineteenth century sexuality operates with an understanding that links the repression of non-procreative sexualities to the demands of bourgeois sexual respectability [see Marcus, 1966; Pearsall, 1969; and Caminos, 1973]. Broadly speaking the argument runs that with the development of bourgeois society, non-productive forms of sexuality were driven underground, and refused access and public visibility.
[Corrigan, 1980_a p.104]

Non-productive means outside the private conjugal family and Harrison and Mort go on to criticise the direct relationships posited by such writers for linking too closely the repression of homosexuality to fears about threats to "the reproduction of bourgeois social relations" and with "capital's demands for an ordered and disciplined labour force." Using Foucault's analysis of what happened to "deviant" sexuality in the nineteenth century, [La Volonte du Savoir, Paris 1976] they agree with him that the shift towards a greater classification of homosexual practices led to different forms of legal practice. By an Act of 1533, re-enacted in 1826, sodomy was punishable by death and in 1861 the sentence became between ten years and life. (It included sodomy between man and woman and between man and beast.) In 1885, the Labouchere Amendment Act¹⁶ was the start of greater classification of acts between homosexuals with a two year minimum sentence for homosexual acts other than buggery. This was the beginning of a more controlling form of power which eventually led to modern developments in the legal regulation of sexual "deviancy". Harrison and Mort are not denying the 'repression' of State apparatuses, but they believe it is important to also look at "the form of power that is implicit in their (deviant sexualities) minute classification and differentiation," which lead to "a more finely developed system of power relations and punishment." (Corrigan, 1980_a, p160)

In examining divorce and property laws, Harrison and Mort set out to show that although they believe Gramsci's view of the State as being the instrument serving to conform civil society to the economic structure is useful, that "a simple functional fit" is a generalisation that does not adequately describe, for example, pre-capitalist patriarchal relationships. The state can transform through legislation, but it does not *create* these relationships. (We will later examine museums in relation to ideology and the state.) The various Acts related to marriage law illustrate some of the response to 'The changing nature of property and the rigidity of the old principles of common law ownership rights.' This, from the 1830's onwards, encouraged "the development of a new more flexible body of law which was based on the principles of 'equity' ... That is, the justice of the individual case ... adapting to a world in which 'real property' took the form of stocks and shares." (Corrigan, 1980a p83)

The main focus for middle class women's struggle for greater equality over property focused on marriage law which allowed a husband to possess all his wife's property and earnings. As the fight for this gathered momentum and the Law Amendment Society was drafting a bill, some concessions were tagged on to the 1857 Matrimonial Causes Act. These involved divorced or legally separated women who were "innocent" parties. Women continued the campaign and were represented by male lawyers to the Select Committee 1867-8. What worried the Committee was the detrimental effect changes could have to marriage and more specifically, to a husband's authority. Would a drunken husband from the lower classes excite greater brutality if she controlled her own earnings? (Wife beating appears to be seen as a working class phenomenon.) The lawyers made appeals to the Committee's belief in England as a

civilised country, saying it was the only one in which this property rule applied and reassured that the husband would not lose his authority. As Harrison and Mort point out, however, the lawyers themselves separated male authority and women's control of property in their reassurances to the Committee.

When the 1870 Married Women's Property Act was passed, it gave women the right to own their own property and earnings, but had some qualifications about inheritances of wives. (They could only inherit £200 maximum from a will and only own property independently if it came to them from an intestate inheritance.) An Act of 1882 followed continuing campaigning from the Married Women's Property Committee and for the first time women could own all inherited property., (There was also a relaxation of restrictions on fathers' passing on of property to daughters but generally, it was still passed to the first born son.)

Of course, these measures did not radically affect the majority of women even though it applied to all. To challenge unfair practices required resources and the middle class feminists were, according to one writer, accommodated because their demands flowed in the same direction as the tide, rather than against it. (L. Holcolme in M. Vicinus, Ed. In Corrigan, 1980 - *A Widening Sphere*, Indiana, 1977, p.26-90) Yet, according to Harrison and Mort, it also reveals an opposing tendency with progressive meanings:

...as the result of early middle class feminist struggle conducted against a particular set of patriarchal relations institutionalised by the State. In that respect they form an example of the way in which particular social groups, other than those involved in economic and political *class* struggle, come to perceive their oppression as maintained and reproduced through the operation of the State ... More generally, it could be argued that the structures of a fully industrial capitalism had come to 'require' some revision of the

moral, cultural and sexual practices and institutions, which were largely the inherited products of previous social formations, [Corrigan, 1980a, p90)

Moreover, the discourse was based on appeals to economic individualism and the rights of the individual within the State.

Divorce legislation was also concerned with property. From 1857 onwards, a greater emphasis was put on a secular code related to marriage. The shift away from ecclesiastical codes to secular regulation however, still combined with "earlier moral and ideological configurations which had been developed under an ecclesiastical tradition." Civil divorce courts could now grant legal separations and divorces, and these changes, although helped by pressure from the legal profession itself, were also bearing witness to the growth of the influence of middle classes.

Interestingly, the Matrimonial Causes Acts of 1878, 84, 86 and 95 were backed up by evidence from social inquiry reports which described violence in working class areas which included wife beating. In 1878, magistrates could allow legal separations, maintenance and legal custodies to battered wives. By the end of the 19th Century, the magistrates courts were used by working class people and the civil courts were used by upper and middle classes. Divorce was too costly for working class people. Harrison and Mort, give figures of over 87,000 legal separations and maintenance orders between 1897-1906 which was a symptom, they say, of "dual morality." Legally separated people could not re-marry.[Figures from O. McGregor, *Divorce in England* 1957 p.24.] They also point out that marriage legislation was not justified by appeals to individualist ideas and here was less "influence of secular ideologies of

individualism" that had applied to money and property. Morality was more public property than money.

In analysing the relationship between these laws and other legislation, Harrison and Mort acknowledge the difficulties, trying to "argue any direct connection between the innovatory legislation on marriage and divorce and the changes effected largely by progressive middle class intellectuals in related spheres such as Education and Poor Law Reform during the period." [Corrigan, 1980^a p.98] They make connections in a wider sense, however, in terms of the growth of bureaucracy and staffing levels in the 19th Century, of which Births, Marriages and Death is an example. It became secularised and centralised in 1836, replacing the older parochial church system of registration and was a response to religious dissenters who had had to get married in Anglican Churches. It was also made possible by the growth of bureaucracy. State intervention here was the result of responses of an existing, but newer structure to changes in other (older) structures. The State showed a tendency to change and expand, modifying its own responses in future, and in areas in society to which it responded. (It continually modified laws over a period of time. The marriage and property laws developed in an almost evolutionary progression.) The position of the Established Church effected the State and legislation can also be related to public campaigning, administrators and professionals and politicians themselves. How does this involve capitalist development? We mentioned earlier the reluctance of Harrison and Mort to see a "functional fit" between the two. However, they pinpoint the laws on property division as being more directly related to capitalism than, for example, other areas connected to sexual regulation (homosexuals and prostitutes) for the simple reason that the

matters concerned are closer to productive capital. We agree that the functional fit is not complete - they were brought about by middle class pressure appealing to the rights of the individual in the economic sphere. (And not by the direct pressures of capital but by the implications capitalist development had for middle class women.) Philip Corrigan emphasises the importance of the work of those involved in the state. Political ideas "arrive in forms which are thoroughly *practised* as particular features of both state formation and *moral regulation*." (Corrigan, 1980a p.292) He says:

My overall point is a simple and vulgar one. The central figures the ideational history hall offers us were *employed* in particular kinds of tasks; Chadwick(1800-1890); James (1773-1836) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873), Kay Shuttleworth (1804-1877); Leonard Horner (1785-1864) and H.S. Trevelyan (1804-1893) are examples of such located intellectuals. My point is also that not only were they employed, but they sought always means through their employment and 'connections' to effect their ideas through the routinisation of particular practices including those of political ritual *successively changed the notion of the state*.
[See Chapter 5 above]

We shall see later some of the effects of these political ideas. Neale notices one instance when the political ideas of some of the philosophical radicals did not, despite its wider implications, change their lifestyles in a personally specific way. J.S. Mill, for example, believed "that men could remain gentlemen and satisfy the passion between the sexes *and* increase levels of consumption."(Neale, '72p141) They could challenge "gentlemanly continence" whilst themselves they "lived according to the norm of gentlemanly continence and met most of the demands of 'moral restraint'." Their ideas of systematic colonisation, however, did have a foothold in "the idea of Empire" which contributed to "the foundation of Empire."

Harrison and Mort also relate morality to imperialist ideology. Along with ideas about childhood, (which Elias notes, comes with greater moral restraint and privacy related to bodily functions), domesticity, motherhood and moral purity is a similar ascendancy in ideas of Nationalism and Imperialism. The notion of 'mother', for example, became connected with expansionism and racist imperialist ideology with an emphasis on "national efficiency and planned reproductive strength, together with panics over class specific underpopulation. Paralleling those constructions, homosexuality also began to be articulated and constructed through ideologies of national decline and of 'race suicide.'"

(They acknowledge Anna Davin's *Imperialism and Motherhood*, Hist. Workshop (5) 1978, for these ideas. Corrigan, 1980a, p103)

Ideas about what constituted progress were still being expressed in the twentieth century. One example reveals the legacy it owes to 19th Century thinking. Beard's *The Industrial Revolution*, [1936 - First published in 1901, it was reprinted seven times up until 1936. He wrote in the Introduction to J.B.Bury 1955] shows his belief in progress based on a mathematical rationality akin to utilitarianism, (see p.104-5. Also p.93. "The certain fact is that man has a laudable, healthy instinct ... to avoid all pain and misery ...) He was criticised for his quoting of Mill, that the greatest root of the evils of industrialism is "the subjection of labour to capital" and the huge profits made by a few. Beard's view of a better society based on achievement for the social good and useful purposes rather than money, does not, however, go into *how* to convince those with money and power that it really is in the best interests of everyone that they relinquish some of their privileges. F. York Powell, who writes the Preface, evokes the name of Darwin in the

name of progress. Linked to rationality it takes on a sort of self-levelling quality which Bagehot described. If something is not suitable, it will change, "If democracy cannot do its work it will, and must, go as other political methods and expedients have gone," and:

... we learn from it (Beard's book), how the civilised world has been changed, and our duties, morals, habits, habitations and connections all altered by the discoveries of a few dozen able men ... Our trade rivals have learnt all they knew till a few years ago from us, we can surely afford to take a lesson from our own ancestry, but we must be prepared to strip off prejudice and renounce hollow formulae. Even if such a sacred institution as a Trades Union stands in the way of real progress, it must change or go ...

Healthy people look to the future, sick people are content to linger through the day, or ready to sink into oblivion; the mark of a healthy nation is that it looks forward, prepared for the future, learns from the past, gets rid of its parasites, shakes off its social diseases

...
[Beard - Preface, XIV-XV to Bury, 1955)

It is a well meaning yet woolly philosophy, which exhorts us to look to the future with hope. It puts forward ideas and ideals which do nothing to analyse *how* society may be changed and it all too often falls back on the concept of "human nature". Democracy, for example, fails if there is deceit and so forth - the future, (depending on our vision of progress) will be better. Yet, for Beard and his critics, the vision was based on a (humanitarian) brand of philosophy. Booth and Rowntree have now shown that "the fallacies of favourite panaceas of thrift and temperance" preached by the owners of wealth mean that other solutions are needed.[xvi-xvii - Note to 2nd Edition.] The early twentieth century did indeed see new legislative efforts in the area of social policy.

Speaking in very general terms, it can be said that different political ideologies in the 20th Century have different ideas about the aims and constituents of progress and civilisation, past, present and

future. There has also been a continuing faith in increasing technology as part of a better future. Writing in 1939, Elias described how global tensions built on monopolies of power and a spiralling of competition, were threatening war. Civilisation would always be a process and not a fact until there was a balance between "imperative drives" and "constraints imposed upon them." True civilisation should be a self-regulatory state and, therefore, we are not civilised in Elias' definition.[Vol.2, pp.319ff] It would be interesting to analyse the 20th Century in terms of a civilising process. As Elias says, it is permanently moving and developing and he contrasts the behaviour and relationships of people in the Middle Ages with the 20th Century:

What was lacking in this *courtois* world, or at least had not been developed to the same degree, was the invisible wall of affects which seem now to rise between one human body and another, repelling and separating, the Wall(sic) which is often perceptible today at the mere approach of something that has been in contact with the mouth or hands of someone else, and which manifests itself as embarrassment at the mere sight of many bodily functions of others ...
[Vol.1, p.70]

It would be an interesting way of bringing together works about varying areas and could include changes in the private/public spheres of life, and manifestations of changes, for example: dieting, the cult of health and slimness, sexual violence, the media, the peace movement, the Police, science and reproduction, sexual politics, charities, language, the monarchy and the list is endless. The process is not one of greater freedoms. Elias noted that in "bathing manners," costumes worn "today" would have caused social ostracism for a 19th Century woman. This development can only happen in a society with "a high degree of restraint" with the curbs of "self control" and "It is a relaxation which remains within the

framework of a particular "civilised" standard of behaviour involving a very high degree of automatic constraint ..."[p.187] Although he calls this a "relative degree of freedom" it is here that Elias reveals to some extent, the male approach and also the great part that feminist research could play in a study of 20th Century civilisation.¹⁷

We have discussed class in terms of behaviour, legislation and some of Elias' ideas of the civilising process and juxtaposed them with ideas of civilisation, colonisation and progress. Next, we will describe some of the manifestations of such ideas in terms of legislative attempts to order society, attempts to reconstruct or manipulate leisure time, the Great Exhibition as an embodiment of some of the above ideas and the history of museums.

This quote from Norbert Elias serves as an inroad into the following work:

It is not a little characteristic of the structure of Western society that the watchword of its colonising movement is "civilisation" ... it is not only the land that is needed, but the people; these must be integrated, whether as workers or consumers, into the web of the hegemonial, the upper class country, with its highly developed differentiation of functions ... it demands a "civilisation" of the colonised,
[Vol.2, p.313]

Notes.

- [1] Elias notes that 'civilisation' can mean different things in different Western countries. In England and France, for example, it refers to political, economic, religious, technological, moral or social facts and also to "accomplishments" and behaviour. In Germany

"civilised" meaning "cultivated" referring to behaviour, social status, housing, manners, speech etc., is kultiviert.

- [2] p. 138-9 Elias discusses the changes in behaviour related to bodily functions and exposure of the body in the C16th, C17th and C18th. Whereas early on, shame in nakedness before others was for the socially inferior to be exposed in front of superiors, it was even considered a kindness if the situation was reversed. This is particularly true of hierarchical, absolutist regimes where distinctions are maintained, "handkerchief, fork, plates, and all their related implements are at first luxury articles with a particular social prestige value." [p. 151] With an increasing interdependence of people based on greater division of labour the superior begins to feel the social restraint also so that "Behaviour ... in more democratised industrial societies is surrounded on all sides with taboos, with trained feelings of shame or embarrassment of varying degrees ..." [p. 139] Slowly then, it has become a general offence and the "social reference" of the shame is forgotten. It is now a social command given to children and ... "it seems to the adult a command of his own inner self and takes on the form of a more or less total and automatic self restraint." [ibid] For a more detailed account see Vol II p. 1-8 and 229ff.
- [3] See P. Corrigan 1980a, p. 55, in which Paul Richards describes the various alliances and tendencies including the 'philosophic radicals'. Manchester Liberals cooperated with London based Benthamites including Chadwick and Roebuck.
- "In theory, the philosophic radicals were democrats, but a Benthamite State would have been heavily authoritarian in practice. The 1834 Poor Law regime designed by Chadwick would seem to confirm this. Yet the New Poor Law was intended as only a beginning of a comprehensive policy to tailor the worker to fit capital's demands *in his own interest*. This meant state provision for the education and health of the popular masses as well as police forces and work houses to deter the idle and rebellious." [p. 59]
- [4] Indeed, in the C19th very few anthropologists lived in the societies under study and the bulk of contact was through exploration, missionary work, administration and Burrow also mentions, through the collection of specimens. [ibid., p. 856] For a survey of anthropology in the last century against the background of social evolutionary philosophy see Burrows passim and chapters on *Sir Henry Maine* and *Tylor and the Growth of Anthropology*. Burrows traces it from J.S. Mills 'System of Logic' in the 1840s and his involvement with the anthropological society in the 1860s and with the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science founded in 1857 through to Spencer in the third quarter of the century. There was then a discernible interest being revived in 'primitive' society and also in social inquiry, for example Booth and Rowntree. In the 50s and 60s comparative social anthropology began with interests in behaviour, institutions, customs etc. Spencer wished to find what part behaviour played in social evolution and others, including E.B. Tylor, Sir Lubbock, Sir Henry Maine and Pitt-Rivers began to write on early history and civilisation. There was a

fascination with finding fundamental laws, eg, J.S. Mill, and the feeling that in order to solve the problems, it was necessary to study previous developments. Darwin had offered the possibility of creating a science out of the study of society. There were differences, however, for example Maine was not a Darwinist, but he shared a belief in evolutionary progress and rested his case on the progression to, or distinction between, barbarism and civilisation. Generally, as Burrows says, the development was to a greater positivism and gradualism to challenge earlier utilitarian tenets. For a detailed analysis of Spencer see Burrows chapter on Henry Spencer.

- [5] There was an apparent denial that the 'savages' had evolved and when I was a student seven years ago the comparative element was still being emphasised as a rationale for studying anthropology and the implicit equation of them and our past. Elias attempts to tackle this by announcing the futility of searching for a starting point. What is certain is that there is movement, change. He is more interested in discovering underlying dynamics of a civilising process. He recognises similarities of 'natural functions' within different totalities. "Thus social drive controls and restrictions are nowhere absent among people... the rationality and affect moulding of someone who has grown up in a working class family are different from those of someone who grew up in secure well to do surroundings".[Vol II p. 278]

- [6] Burrow sees what he describes as Evolutionary Positivism as a tenacious theory which persisted in the face of rival European Theories. It was a key social theory partly because it touched an emotional trigger in "mankind" in Victorian Britain - it showed man had a glorious future. This is discernible in Great Exhibition rhetoric, and in many areas including educational reform, for example the provision of scientific education. All in all it was a theory with conservative elements which attacked 'utopian' ideas. Burrow, 1966, p. 265, says 'for once it was the radicals who borrowed the conservative's clothes.'

- [7] Elias also describes how these constraints operate "as a result of ... knowledge of the possible consequences of ... moves" and to some extent as patterns of behaviour learned as a child. Women, for example, can identify with this in fears about being attacked and the constraints that fear ultimately has on their actions and freedom of movement.

- [8] T.H.S. Escott says "Many thriving representatives of Lancashire trade and manufacture regard the pecuniary reward of their energy and enterprise as a means, not as an end - as building the edifice ... Their aim is not even mainly selfish and the Lancashire merchant hopes above all things to transmit the fortune he has made to a son who will add to it the graces of an education and a training which he himself has not. Music, painting, the drama, collections of art treasures, science, are regarded not merely as superfluous embellishments, but as the indispensable accompaniments of

prosperous existence." - note the description of what was regarded as culturally fitting to existence(1885) p76.

- [9] George Eliot describes a similar affectation as that of the Mancunian middle class. In *Scenes of Clerical Life* she writes about rural England in the 1830s. Mr Gilfil, the vicar "had grazing land of his own about five miles off, which a bailiff, ostensibly a tenant, farmed under his direction ... To hear him discussing the respective merits of the Devonshire breed and the shorthorns, or the last foolish decision of the magistrates about a pauper, a superficial observer might have seen little difference, beyond his superior shrewdness, between the vicar and his bucolic parishioners, for it was his habit to approximate his accent and mode of speech to theirs, doubtless because he thought it a mere frustration of the purposes, of language to talk of 'shear-hogs' and 'ewes' to men who habitually said "sharrags" and "yowes." Nevertheless the farmers themselves were perfectly aware of the distinction between them and the parson, and had not at all the less belief in him as a gentleman and a clergyman for his easy speech and familiar manners. Mrs. Parrot smoothed her apron and set her cap right with the utmost solicitude when she saw the vicar coming, made him her deepest curtsy, and every christmas had a fat turkey ready to send him with her 'duty'. And in the most gossiping colloquies with Mr. Gilfil, you might have observed that both men and women 'minded their words' and never became indifferent to his approbation." p. 125.
- [10] Waagen, Vol II, Letter XXI, p. 341, mentions this; "Although, by the liberality of the Duke of Northumberland, the public were permitted access to this fine place during the summer of 1851, I was not able to command the time to go, which I regretted the less as I understood from good authority that the house does not contain pictures of any great value."
- [11] B also included all working class women and along with the middle class they were deferential, whereas the other class, according to Neale, were not. This is an exaggeration. Charles Shaw, for example, describes a vicious fight at work where "...a big Yorkshire woman who worked in one of the shops ... rushed to the lads, separated them, and stood in front of the men and defied them. She was a tall woman with ... great brawny arms ... her eyes flashed ... and her arms were held out as if for business if required. The men slunk away..."[Shaw1983p190] Whilst it is true that working class women were considered subordinate it is not strictly accurate to characterise them as deferential. Neale says that *all* women were deferential moreover, because they were all dependent. This is again a generalisation which is more ironic when one considers Neale is attacking generalisations made in the area of class.
- [12] An advocate, along with J.S. Mill and other radicals, of systematic colonisation which wanted government to sponsor emigration where men and women could shift surplus capital and spread population to bigger areas. There they could be happy living within the bounds 'of gentlemanly continence' but still having a more natural sexual existence. See Neale 1972, p. 134. In the 1880s, Escott, 1885, p. 571,

wrote about the emigration societies in Britain and he advocated an extension of their work because education provided an increasing number of 'fairly intelligent boys and girls' who needed remunerative work. Emigration could, therefore, 'draught of a certain annual percentage of the surplus population before they could learn the evil ways of idleness.' There was also a philanthropic effort to get state aided emigration because "it is argued that private enterprise and benevolent efforts are no longer sufficient to deal with the problem of emigration." Some state aided emigrants in The Cape of Good Hope and Canada had proved good workers so that "the advantages gained are of a cumulative character, as such colonists benefit England by their absence and the colony by their presence." Other emigrants thought to benefit Britain through their absence were those transported as punishments. Escott describes this system which broke down because people eventually *wanted* to emigrate, as unequal not because it was cruel etc, but because "some suffered severely, others were rapidly transformed into millionaires." Also the punishment 'was inflicted at so great a distance from home that it failed to act as a warning to those who remained behind.' (1885)

p 239-240. Booth also recommended emigration to solve certain social problems advocating moral colonies for "fallen women" in Canada etc.

- [13] The middle classes were entertaining and being entertained more frequently and more went on holiday and this style of life was being adopted by professional people. G. Steadman-Jones "Languages of Class" (1983) p. 187 from J.A. and Olive Banks *Feminism and Family Planning in Victorian England* (1965) p. 71.
- [14] Elias owes some of his emphasis on generalities based on psychological elements to Freud and he acknowledges his debt to Freud for his psychoanalytical insights. See Vol I n. 81 pp. 301-2.
- [15] Pornography cannot be viewed simply from the perspective of the sameness of fantasies through time. Elias sees the shift towards a private/public dichotomy and concealment of certain areas of life, also in their depiction, as contributing towards. "But neither is the naked body depicted here (medieval times) in the way it sometimes appeared in later times, in "private drawings" passed secretly from hand to hand." Vol I, p. 214.
- [16] This was in the aftermath of prominent homosexual trials and campaigns for moral purity and its main aim related to raising the age of consent for heterosexuals and safeguarding children from prostitution.
- [17] Feminists have noted that the "relative freedom" generally advertised as a liberalisation is often a bind on the behaviour of women, for example the freedom to wear certain clothes only to be criticised for it if attacked by a man, and the "permissiveness" of the Page Three Girl set against attitudes to breast feeding etc.

CHAPTER 4.

Progress	231.
Exhibitions	240.
Some Personnel	244.
Arrangement and Ideas	252.
Some Outcomes of 1851	262.
Pitt Rivers and Progress	269.
Notes	282.

The Great Exhibition

Progress

At the opening of the Great Exhibition in 1851, Prince Albert proudly announced that nearly one half of the exhibitors were British and that, together with the the forty or so other countries represented, they comprised 'almost the whole of the civilised nations of the globe.' [Extract from Opening Speech - Taken from Harvie et al, Eds. 1970, p.236]

For many contemporary commentators, including the press, the Exhibition had a myriad of meanings, but generally under the heading of 'Progress', in science and technology, economics and politics. Britain was the leader in this process and there were many expansive statements from the Exhibition's supporters about the coming 'unity of mankind'. The Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations, (to give it its full title), had great significance for many people on a number of different levels, as we shall later see.

At the opening ceremony, it appeared that some people felt it was a 'glorious inauguration' of Queen Victoria above whom rose a 'glittering arch more lofty and spacious than the vaults of even our noblest cathedrals'. [*The Times* 2 May, 1851] The scene was likened to that of Heaven, with everyone present seemingly gathered round the throne of the Maker. Interestingly, as if describing the historical process itself, the

article goes on, '... there was so much that seemed accidental and yet had meaning, that no-one could be content with simply what he saw ...' [ibid] The Exhibition brings together many of the issues previously discussed, so that, although the subject is well-documented, (which shows its significance both then and more recently) with a few exceptions, most writings are weighted towards the descriptive.

Of course, the Exhibition had its criticisms, such as it left out the working classes in the organisation and also it left out the 'sweat of labour.' [See C.R.Fay, 1951, p.42-3] Some Tories were against it for Protectionist reasons and it also had racist critics. Once, however, the project began to take off with the support and subscriptions of middle and some aristocratic people, the comments are favourable on the whole. They are also concerned with the 'grand themes' of Progress, Mankind, Civilisation and so forth. Later historical accounts show that although historians may criticise the Victorians or call them 'naive', that they nevertheless share something of the Victorians' belief in 'things British'. There is a taken for granted smoothness in approach and interpretation which tends to use such words as 'our' and 'we' when referring to British achievement or peace, prosperity and progress.

One historian describes the assertions of world unity as 'arrogant' in the light of the war in the Crimea, which was only a few years after the Exhibition.[David Thompson, 1951, p.103] Another, describing the aftermath of the annexing of Alsace Lorraine, says that 'the sense of international goodwill and the brotherhood of the human race, which had lent an ideal halo to the commercialism of the Great Exhibition in 1851, had faded into air.' [G.M. Trevelyan, 1968, p.455] Trevelyan,

reiterates the point and reveals his belief in 'our' political system and progress:

The same feelings of self-satisfaction, or pious thanksgiving, underlay the emotions of Englishmen three years later at Prince Albert's Great Exhibition, held under the glass pleasure-dome in Hyde Park. The unfortunate Europeans, having failed to master our secret of combining liberty with order, were invited as a consolation prize, to come and admire the peace, progress and prosperity of Britain. The Great Exhibition, the first of many such in all the capitals of Europe, began a new era of international trade advertisement.
[This refers to the 1848 Chartist Petition seen by many as its 'last flicker,' Trevelyan, 1968, p290)

In another passage, Trevelyan refers to the 1848 revolutions in Europe in contrast to the Chartist Petition of that year and concludes that 'our' political and social problems had already been solved by past and present monarchs and politicians 'and above all by the calm good sense of the British people'. Thus:

It was difficult to understand what was going on across the Channel, but there was satisfaction in the thought that we were not as other nations ... In the middle of the European revolutions the first part of Macaulay's history was published, and attained at once a popularity and influence analagous to that of Scott, Byron or Dickens. There were many grounds for its success, but one was that it presented a reasoned eulogy of Britain and all things British, as that age understood them. Nor could the historian resist the temptation of inserting a passage proudly contrasting 1688 at home with 1848 abroad.
[Although Trevelyan was the great-nephew of Lord Macaulay he is not exaggerating the latter's popularity. Macaulay's *History of England* Volumes 1 & 2, sold 22,000, 1848, and Volumes 3 & 4 sold 26,500 in ten weeks. By 1863, the total number of volumes sold was 267,000. Figures from R.D. Altick, 1957, p.388. Trevelyan's own *Social History of England* was a runaway best seller in the late '40's. As for Dickens, he was selling novels around that time totalling between 20-30,000 a year.[p.383] See pp.180-2 re, the Clarendon Commission's investigation into the state of public schools, 1864, Macaulay was read in pupils' spare time. D. Thomson describes Macaulay as "a fair spokesman of the middle classes" - 1951, p104)

Britain had passed through her revolutionary period and had reached a degree of civilisation characterised by peace, prosperity and

moderation. She was ahead in her evolutionary progress. Macaulay himself wrote in one of his essays of his faith in the people of England which gives 'comfort' and 'good hope' and that it had not been the State 'but by the prudence and energy of the people, that England has hitherto been carried forward in civilisation.' [Lord Macaulay's *Essays and Lays of Ancient Rome*, London 1902, 'Southey's Colloquies on Society' January, 1830] Although the Exhibition has often been held up as an example of 'national pride and momentary class reconcilliation', [Altick, 1978, p.456] the period before the actual opening reveals many expressions of fear that the working classes would be riotous and revolutionary. There were also precautions taken against such eventualities. Audrey Short, in her article *Workers Under Glass in 1851* [1966] describes how Prince Albert could write to the King of Prussia to allay his fears of insurrection by saying that although there were political refugees in Britain, '... they have realised the British people have nothing in common with their feelings.' [p.193] A few days later, however, Albert was prepared to ban the public from the opening ceremony in order to protect the Queen.

By 1851, as the Census revealed, half the population lived in towns. According to Ms. Short, the promoters of the Exhibition were faced with the problem of what they were to make of the 'rising class of wage earners?' Had all those who had eulogised on the 'reasonableness' of the people merely been expressing a wish rather than stating a fact? The champagne toasts given to 'The Working Men of England' and the praise of their industry and social maturity did not, however, encourage the Royal Commissioners for 1851 to facilitate organised involvement of working class people. The case of the Working Classes Committee illustrates how closed the Royal Commission was to allowing any supporters of ideas of

working class participation. Its initial meeting was at the Society of Arts in March 1850, and was convened by the Bishop of Oxford who had been urged by Prince Albert to invite 'people like Lord Ashley, Mr. C. Dickens, Dr. Southwood Smith and others most frequently in communication with best of the working classes.' (Taken from R. Wilberforce *Life of Bishop Wilberforce* London, 1881, pp.11 & 30 Short, 1966, p194)

It also included Lovett and Place and its aim was to ensure that the working classes attended the Exhibition. The Royal Commission refused to sanction this aim and the most general reason against it was that the whole class issue was too touchy to highlight. It dissolved itself after the fifth meeting. Ms. Short discusses the fact that the Commissioners or the 'ruling classes' had a 'residual distrust for the masses' and their behaviour. As we have seen, there is much evidence of characterisations of the working classes as uncouth and liable to riot alongside views certainly expressed by some Commissioners in praise of the 'working man'. This can be seen, however, within the framework of other debates such as the education question.[See Chapter I) . Although it should not be forgotten that working class people had very often made formal and informal attempts to educate themselves individually and cooperatively. Some members of the Commission, like Peel, were glad that it could no longer seem a big issue and it was hoped that provincial committees would 'do something' when the proper time came. Things could then flow naturally as a matter of course.[There were 297 Local Committees formed to promote the Exhibition and they were given much publicity, whereas, the Working Classes Committee came and went 'without fanfare'.

In the event, however, the public ~~were~~ allowed into the opening ceremony and all went according to plan.' The next worry for the organisers was the first cheap or 'shilling day,' for which, the Police were increased by 38 Sergeants and 400 Constables. (In all, the Police had an extra thousand men for the Exhibition and the troops around London were doubled.)

The admission fees and days were as follows:

TYPE	DAYS AVAILABLE	NO. OF VISITS	COST
Season Tickets	141	773,766	3gns-men 2gns-women (reduced after July)
£1 Visitors (2nd & 3rd May)	2	1,042	
5s. 0d Visitors (Sat)	28	245,389	
2s. 6d Visitors (Fri)	30	579,579	
1s. 0d Visitors (mon - Thurs)	80	4,439,419	

Note that Saturday and Friday were more expensive and that the shilling visitors were in the overwhelming majority. Different writers gave various figures for attendance but they are all around six million: Farr - 6,063,986

Beaver - 6,039,195 (Presumably from Gibbs-Smith who has the same)

de Maré - 6,201,856

Allowing for multiple visits most put the number of visitors at about 4,000,000.²

In a letter to *The Times* (23 January, '51), Paxton asked that working men of England have free entrance to the Exhibition. The Editor got in touch with Lord Grenville, one of the Commissioners, and they arranged a strategy. It could not be seen that such a request from a popular figure was refused out of hand. The letter was published along

with an editorial saying free admission was impractical and following issues printed criticisms from workers and others so that eventually the idea dissolved. (A. Short, 1966, p150)

It had been decided that the Exhibition was to be self-supporting and it was thought that a shilling was an amount affordable by the respectable working classes. The likely behaviour of the people and the foreigners was, according to Mayhew, the universal topic of conversation, 'would they have come sober? will they destroy the things? ... But they have surpassed in decorum the hopes of their well-wishers.' (Mayhew, 1851, p.161) That day, the British Museum had sentries posted and the staff had been armed. As for the Crystal Palace itself, Wellington had warned 'the glass is very thin.' (Altick, 1978, p.457) The organisers were relieved that the shilling visitors (who ensured the financial success of the Exhibition) proved to be an interested audience on the whole. Queen Victoria sometimes went on shilling days and on one occasion, the Duke of Wellington was nearly stampeded when a group of people recognised him. There were also parties of Sunday Schools and trips from the provinces and factories. Working class people from all over the country had joined clubs to save up for the trip to London. In the Potteries, some money was donated to saving clubs by middle class philanthropists and in August, several trains took 1,100 members to the Exhibition. (Julie Wilkinson, 1980, p.149).

Manufacturers in this area also organised trips for workers and one such venture lasted a week. According to the *Staffordshire Advertiser* [June 28, 1851], Mr. William Davenport, a Longport manufacturer, converted a London warehouse into sleeping accommodation for his workers. There

was a dining-room providing breakfast, supper, stout, and a reading-room.(J. Wilkinson, 1980, p150)

Over the period that the Exhibition was open, these sort of visitors were in the majority, but on the very first shilling day, although there was relief at the behaviour of visitors, there was also surprise that:

on the eventful day, the hundred thousand visitors "in posse", dwindled down to twenty thousand "in esse". The two policemen who had been placed outside the gilt cage of the Mountain of Light, the extra 'force' that was stationed beside the Queen of Spain's jewels, the additional 'Peelites' who had been quartered at every point and turn of the interior to direct the crowd which way to move, stared and grinned at one another as they saw the people saunter, one by one, into the building ...
[Mayhew, no date, p153-4)

Mayhew goes on to say that the Executive Committee gradually realised that it was because the people were at work and would save up money to come at holiday time. At Whitsun there were again the barriers of police, but even less people than before and this was put down to working class self-denial. Mayhew says that although this is a pretty compliment, a look at Hampton Court and Greenwich Fair would have shown the working class as unremarkable for its self-denial. His argument runs thus: it is put about that there is a special delight in industry, when, in reality, continued labour is repulsive to human nature and indeed, if it was a delight then why do some pay large sums in order to avoid it? Moreover, if work is a supreme enjoyment, then where is the virtue in it? Mayhew believes that the real reason that many working class people did not go to the Exhibition at first, was that simply no one from their class had been and talked about it in the pub or factory. Once seen and talked about, however, they were eager to go. Mayhew saw an educational potential

in the Exhibition; "that the labourer had come to learn, that the 'shilling folk' treat it as a place of instruction and that it should teach the dignity of 'those thought to be the inferior grades of labour' (Mayhew, p161)

There was a fair in Hyde Park at the same time as the Exhibition which had been suggested by two showmen, Nelson Lee and John Johnson. It was to be a repeat of a fair held in the park in 1838 to celebrate Victoria's Coronation. That had proved a profitable venture for the showmen and had 'witnessed unprecedented cooperation between the Police ... and the showmen ...' [Hugh Cunningham, in Donajrodzki, 1977, p.167] They argued that if the government allowed them to stage a fair in 1851 that 'persons least likely to benefit the Great Industrial Exhibition may be withdrawn from the immediate Neighbourhood of Hyde Park by a class of entertainment found to be the most attractive to them.' [From T. Frost, *The Old Showmen and the Old London Fairs* - London 1881, p.326-9] As Cunningham points out, this was a strange turnabout, where fairs were being presented as an aid, rather than a threat, to public order.

In Mayhew's description of working people at the Exhibition, they are eagerly listening to explanations of how the machinery works, close observers of the power looms etc., and intelligently curious. It will have come as a surprise to the showmen, therefore, (and no doubt to many others), that the fair in Hyde Park was not a financial success and that the Exhibition proved to be a bigger attraction.

Exhibitions

In the context of worries about working class behaviour, the organisers did not fully appreciate that exhibitions of various sorts were not entirely alien to many working class people. These included travelling exhibitions, 'curio' collections in public houses and numerous exhibitions shown in connection with local societies, including Mechanic's Institutes. Although some of the Institutes in the Potteries held exhibitions of pictures, there is evidence, from the mid-1850's onwards, of a greater enthusiasm within the Exhibition Committee for industrial displays. [Wilkinson, '80 p.143. There were five Institutes in the Potteries: Hanley, 1826; Stoke, 1846; Longton, 1848; Fenton, 1853] These exhibitions were seen by the organisers as a type of informal adult education. Although there were many art exhibitions, it was found that industrial ones were more popular. Julie Wilkinson notes that there was a 'tone of exclusivity' at the former type, even when the admission price was halved.

A North Staffordshire Industrial Exhibition in 1865 was a success and it included musical evenings, half price tickets and school parties. The 1866 exhibition was a failure in terms of numbers. There appears to be no clear reason why it failed, but the public were seen as fickle. It may have been that there had simply been a surfeit of this type of exhibition. Much later in the century, a now popular device, the combination of fair and exhibition, took place in this area, at Clough Hall (1889). [Knight's Cyclopaedia of the Exhibitions of the Industry of All Nations, London, 1851, notes that Davenport Mechanics' Institute held an exhibition of art and manufacture, September 1850, to celebrate a new Hall. p.xxiv] Other exhibitions included those by missionary societies

who showed their work in the context of an expanding British Empire. The many travelling exhibitions were generally 'light entertainment and education' (Wilkinson, '80, p152) and dioramas on current affairs were popular (for example, India). One journalist described such an occasion: 'We became more intimate with Arabs, camels, Nile boats and Egyptian antiquities after two hours of frolic and fun, than we should have been after reading volumes written upon the same subject in the ordinary dry style ...' [From *The Staffordshire Advertiser* May 24th 1851] In 1854, a Mr. Box Brown, an escaped slave, travelled through the Potteries with a panorama of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and attracted huge audiences. [ibid] This exhibition of people as curiosities, generally associated with fairs, was also incorporated into later music hall acts.³ It was as early as 1845 that legislation made it possible for rates to be levied for local museums, but it was not until much later that they became a reality. The Mechanics' Institute in Hanley, however, had a museum as early as 1840. It was described in 1843 as 'a Museum and Repository of Curiosities of Nature and Art, particularly the Potters Art ...' [From J. Ward - *The Borough of Stoke on Trent* 1843.] Many such 'mini-museums' existed in Mechanics' Institutes throughout Britain, but apart from these, there were large-scale temporary exhibitions in various towns that took place before the Great Exhibition. In Leeds, for example, 183,913 people attended an arts and manufactures event in 1839 and in Sheffield, about the same time, 70,000 went to a similar exhibition. The national press commented on the latter and said that 'the greatest order and decorum were at all times observed.' [Altick, 1978, p.455] In Birmingham, there was an Exposition of Industry, in September 1849, which had nearly 100,000 attendances. It had free entrance for many pupils and a large number of

workers and it had been found that the greatest numbers came between 6pm and 8pm.[Knight's Cyclopaedia 1851 xx-xxii] This was probably due to hours of work. Of course, most working class visitors to the Great Exhibition from provincial towns would have needed a day's holiday, (Shilling days were Monday to Thursday.) Although the success of these exhibitions did not go entirely unnoticed in London, it appears that when it came to the Great Exhibition, that the major seat of worry about the behaviour of the working classes, was here. Ms Short notes the reaction to the news that Prince Albert, two weeks from the opening, had decided that it should be closed to the public:

There was an immediate furor. Open challenges to trouble were not the British way. Most distasteful was "the proof of distrust which exclusion of the public indicated," "The Queen", observed *The Times*, "is not Lady Godiva,"[16 April, 1851, p.4] At the Crystal Palace, the contractor, Charles Fox, expected some kind of explosion. Richard Cobden, and others among the Commissioners expressed serious doubts about the way things were being handled. The Queen and her husband had several interviews with Lord John Russell, who said that it might be as well not to let alarm grow; "fashionable society might be disregarded but it would be a pity to alienate the manufacturers and middle classes,"
[Short, 1966, p198)

Russell emphasises that it is more important not to alienate the middle classes. Fashionable people may not want to mix with 'the public', but the views of the middle classes are more important. Albert's decision was prompted by fear for the safety of his wife, but there is no doubt that it was within a general climate of concern about 'the bearded foreigner' and possible revolutionary connections. It was feared these could cause sedition here and fears of huge crowds of working class people in one place all conspired to foster this general climate. Exclusion of the middle classes could not be brooked. It was also important that the

Exhibition had an image of unity.(As far as the working classes were concerned, it was the manufacturers outside London that showed less worry - Altick [1978, p.455] mentions that the Mechanics' Institute movement was not strong in London. The idea of holding an international industrial exhibition is generally accorded to two men, Prince Albert and Henry Cole. They were known to each other through meetings at the Society of Arts.(The Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce, was founded in 1754 and had its first exhibition in 1756, - see Altick, 1978. Prince Albert became its President in 1847 and the Society then got its Royal Charter.)

The event for 1851 was first announced in *The Times* (27th Aug. 1849) when it was stated that the Society, a private body, was to organise an exhibition 'to worthily represent the present manufacturing position of the country.' There were to be no government funds involved. The Society was aware that the French had held eleven industrial exhibitions since 1798. Cole had visited the 1848 Paris exhibition and the Society had a report of the event. It was decided that the exhibition planned for 1851 would be international which, according to Cole, would place Britain in 'fair competition with that of other nations.' [Du Mare, 25, from Introduction to the *Official Catalogue of the Great Exhibition*]

A Royal Commission was set up in the January of 1850. Of the 27 Commissioners there were, apart from Prince Albert: 3 Earls, 1 Duke, 3 Lords, the Prime Minister Russell, and numerous M.P's, 10 Royal Society members, 5 Knights, the President of the Geological Society, the President of the Institute of Civil Engineering, the Chairman of the East India Co., and various industrialists. (Of course some of these titles and statuses overlap. For a full list see Gibbs-Smith, 1964, pp. 35-36) There was also

a Building Committee of whom the Duke of Buccleuch K.G., FRS, Earl of Ellesmere, FSA, Charles Barry, R.A., FRS, William Cubitt, FRS., Pr. I.C.E. and Robert Stephenson, M.P., FRS., were also members of the Royal Commission. The others were C.R. Cockerell, R.A., I.K. Brunel FRS and Thomas L. Donaldson M.I.B.A. Chaired by Cubitt, they eventually decided on a design by Paxton. One of the considerations was based on an earlier decision that the space had to be divided with one half for Britain and the Empire and the other for foreign exhibitors. (Descriptions of the building and its erection can be found in De Mare,'73, p31, Gibbs-Smith, '64, pII, Beaver, '70, p15 and Appendices I and II.)

The Finance Committee was no less distinguished than the others. It had an Earl, a Lord, and comprised mostly of M.P.'s. The Executive Committee had 6 members and 2 special Commissioners, and included Cole, who was the 'mainspring.' (Fay, '51p33) There were also, on the Medal Committee, (of whom four were British), two Royal Academicians, - W. Dyce and J. Gibson.

They were either aristocratic or middle class, including politicians, educationalists, industrialists, artists, scientists and engineers, as we shall shortly see.

Some Personnel

A brief look at some of those involved, gives a better idea of the parts they played in creating the Great Exhibition.

One of the aristocrats, the Earl of Granville, (1815-91), was 'persona gratissima' to the Royal family and destined to have a long

political career. At the time of the Exhibition, he was Vice President of The Board of Trade.[Fay, 1951, p.32] Other aristocratic members of the Commission, and some who served on the Committees, had educational and political connections. Generally, however, the Exhibition was the work of the middle class industrialists, bankers and engineers. The engineers were Russell, Stevenson and Cubitt. Bazley was a cotton magnate, later to become an M.P. and baronet; Gott was the head of a big woollen clothing manufacturers and a Conservative and Gibson was from the silk industry. There were also representatives from banking and insurance. Cole, himself, is described as being a friend of "all the most illustrious thinkers of the day" including Mill, Grote, Buller and Chadwick.[Hobhouse, p.5] He had a long administrative career as Assistant Keeper at the Records Office, and had collaborated with Rowland Hill on the introduction of the Penny Post and edited the *Journal of Design and Manufactures* (which he had opened in 1849. He is also described as the inventor of the Christmas card.) Usually called a Victorian 'man of energy', Cole, like Chadwick, had faith in bureaucracy.(Ames, p.84, says that Dickens satirised Cole in *Hard Times*, as Gradgrind's friend who was 'always in training, always with a system to force down the general throat like a bolas ...') The middle class men in what Ames calls 'the Prince's team' are representative of the professional, political and wealthy industrialist strata of that grouping.[See Richards, Chapter 3 in P. Corrigan, 1980a] The choice of Cobden (who replaced Peel after his sudden death), had caused surprise, especially when it came out that Prince Albert had been so keen that he had asked him in person.[D. Bennett, 1977, p.202] Cobden was not keen to work with the Protectionists, like Lord Stanley, but the Radical M.P. agreed, sat as a Commissioner and was on the Finance Committee. Albert's

reasons were his admiration for a hard worker and the fund-raising capabilities Cobden had shown in his work for the Anti-Corn Law League.

One of those honoured by the Queen for services to the Great Exhibition, was Paxton; (he was Knighted along with Cubitt and Fox; Playfair, Cole and Northcote became Companions of the Bath.) Queen Victoria thought it was "an immense though deserved distinction, and very striking as to the possibility of the lowest being able, by their own merits, to rise to the highest grade of society, - he was only a gardener's boy ..."(Gibbs-Smith, '64p25) From one who was extolled as an example of what could be attained no matter what class you came from, we will have a closer look at the life of the person who devised the cataloguing system of the Exhibition.

Lyon Playfair is also interesting because in his background, views and career, he illustrates how many middle class 'strands' came together in 1851. Born in 1818, he was brought up in a well known St. Andrews family. Described as a 'Scot's Oxford', it had a small circle of 'cultivated people.' (Wemyss Reid, 1900, p.21) 'Nabobs' were a common feature of this place of retired military and East India Company officials, and the Playfairs' also had colonial connections with India. Lyon Playfair's father and great uncles were in medicine and the East India Company and two were army officers there.. Playfair's own brothers followed similar careers, one was a surgeon in the East India Company, another was a Colonel in the Indian Army; one, an "eminent physician" and another in The Royal Engineers. Fay mentions how Playfair supported free trade and the strengthening of imperial ties. (1951, p36)

His uncle, Hugh, who was a Tory civic reformer, was a retired Major and Playfair says 'he had an influence on my life.' He set about improving

the pavements in St. Andrews and 'forced money by subscription with the audacity of a highwayman.' [Reid, 1900, p.18] He would have, with those skills, been welcome on the Commission of 1851. Playfair says his influence was far reaching as "he certainly inspired me with the love of work, and with a sense of duty of working for others ..."

Playfair's first public work was in the post-1832 period, when the role of the State was hotly debated and he was 'present at the birth of sanitary reform.' [Reid, 1900, p.7] For many years, he was one of those active men "'behind the scenes', (who) exercise so great a control over public affairs." [p.5] His first state service was as a Commissioner in the Inquiry into the Health of Towns in 1844, when he investigated the Lancashire area.⁴ He was shocked at what he found and put down the "depressing conditions" to working class intemperance. According to Richards, "for 'Health of Towns' we should read a much wider concern for the working class, best explained by commitment to the Industrial Revolution as a progressive force overbalanced by fear of its destruction of social order." [Corrigan, 1980a, p.60]

It was about this time that Playfair was making friends with Chadwick, Rowland Hill and J.S. Mill. They formed a group called 'Friends in Council' who met to discuss questions of political economy. Although he had tried, at his father's wishes, to become a merchant like his uncle, (described as a "merchant of probity and philanthropy" by Playfair,) [Reid, 1900, p.19], Playfair's main interest was in science. He was fortunate that his father's letters from India were full of encouragement; as he says, 'for my scientific studies and supplying me freely with money to prosecute them.' When he went to London in 1845, he worked for the new School of Mines, in Jermyn Street, which was being developed in the

Geological Museum. There were laboratories, lectures to students and also evening courses for working men who 'always attended to the full capacity
 Reid, I900,
 of our lecture theatre.'[p.93] As a parallel, "to visit the school became fashion for the men of leisure. Besides my regular pupils, I had in one year the late Duke of Marlborough ..." By then, he had gained a "reputation as an inquirer" and "there was scarcely a month in which the Government
 Reid, I900
 did not demand my services."[p.94] This included the sanitation at Buckingham Palace and the conditions of the mines. He was also to be part of the education movement⁵ for a system of science and technical education. This was linked to his views on the changes brought about by the social and economic changes of the Industrial Revolution. He believed that they led to the need for more skilled workmen whose skill would better their wages and social life. He had faith in the working classes combining for shorter hours and so forth, and also was "unswerving and inflexible in his adherence to the political economy which he had learned
 Reid, I900,
 as a youth."[p.9-10] During his career, he cooperated with Royalty, aristocracy and other middle class politicians. He was a Liberal M.P. who, for many years, represented a Conservative constituency, (Edinburgh and St. Andrews). He had won, according to Reid, because of his renown as a public servant and his 'personal popularity with the constituents',

- or, as he put it himself, "I always had large classes and between my
 Reid, I900,
 former pupils and myself, there was a fond attachment."[p.210] Reid also says that Playfair's position was similar to a civil servant who has to subordinate his political views to serve the public. This academic and family popularity was, however, waning as his former pupils and he drifted apart over the years and by 1885, his Liberalism proved a real problem. It was then that he stood for the working class constituency of

South Leeds and there that he spoke at Mechanics' Institutes on the need for Scientific and technical education for the working man. (For a full outline of his career, see Reid 1900. He did hold the post of Postmaster General for a short period, Deputy Speaker and many other positions.)

Thus, as we have seen, Playfair is representative of the newer administrative/intellectual politicians.[Fay, 1951, p.34] As far as the Royalty involved in the Great Exhibition is concerned, Prince Albert appears to share many opinions with those on the Commission. When he had married Queen Victoria, he had to face prejudices against his nationality and it was something that dogged him thereafter. Beaver says that he, "in common with all foreigners, was distrusted and even disliked by most of the people of Britain." [Fay, 1951, p.11]

Some of the entries in Queen Victoria's journal during the Exhibition, belie the anxieties underlying Albert's position. One says: "Good Stockmar was with me for some time and in the course of conversation said how my beloved one *was now* appreciated." [May 4th 1851]

Beaver also notes that Prince Albert never lost his German accent and that he was made to feel a foreigner 'even in Court circles.' [p.1] One writer apparently still disliked him when he wrote in 1937 that:

To the end of his life, Prince Albert never understood the three qualities which more than any others make an Englishman acceptable to his fellows: he never acquired any humour, any manners, or any reticence,
[Christopher Hobhouse, 1937, p.1]

This conflicts with other writers' views, (for example, D. Bennett, who also gives many examples of how he was liked by those who worked with him on the Exhibition.) Hobhouse, continuing, criticises Albert's 'continental politeness' which caused people to be ill-at-ease. His

invective includes accusing Albert of pomposity, saying he was a "royal saint" who was good, but not liked. He paints a portrait of a bourgeois man rather than an aristocrat, saying that Prince Albert hated waste and "he must reform, improve, progress." (Hobhouse, '50p2) Perhaps the bulk of these comments reveal more about English attitudes than they do about German. It is true, however, that Prince Albert "admired Peel, was a strong free-trader, and took more interest in scientific and commercial progress and less in sport and fashion than was at all popular in the best society." (Trevelyan, '68, p293) Indeed, when Albert was young, he had been taught by a middle class tutor called Florshutz, (when a teenager he had translated Goethe's *Faust* into French. Elias noted how Goethe was favoured in circles outside the courtly, aristocratic and identifies him with the middle class intelligensia.) Later, he studied at Bonn University where he was enrolled as an ordinary student, (noblemen could come and go as they pleased.) Professor Fichte had a profound effect on Albert and taught him that "through work and effort shall come salvation." (D. Bennett, '77p22) A firm believer in self-improvement, he said that when he married Queen Victoria "he was only the husband and not the master in the home." a reaction due both to his class attitudes *and* his sex.] He fought for more consultation with his wife over state papers and gradually assumed more political responsibility. The admiration he had for Peel was mutual and in 1841 the latter asked him to head a Royal Commission of The Fine Arts (where Albert met Eastlake who served on the Commission of 1851.) Albert was aware that he was considered as a "foreign upstart" and became determined to prove this wrong. In 1843, he visited Birmingham, though Peel warned him that the Mayor was a Chartist, but, as Albert wrote to Stockmar, (17th December, 1843), "the

people regarded the visit as a great proof of confidence and did all they could to give assurance of their loyalty."(See F. Eyck, 1959. In 1851, Wellington had wanted to have roads cleared for the movement of troops, should there be a riot, "until persuaded by Albert that it would be a mistake to have a soldier in sight." - Bennett, 1977, p204)

Albert felt that ministers did not know how to relate to him because he did not fit in with their assumptions of how a Prince behaved. He did not drink much, or gamble.(Bennett, '77p113)Hobhouse comments on this in a derogatory way: "All his actions were inspired by motives of the highest order, but not one of them was inspired by genuine, static, unmoral enjoyment." This is because he was a believer in PROGRESS from "education down to drains."(Hobhouse, 1950,p3) Hobhouse's attitude relates to his own time and also to the nineteenth century on two levels; the racist assumptions about Prince Albert and the characterisation of him as a middle class bureaucrat, strict and dour. Even years after 1851, Prince Albert was still sensitive to it. In a memorandum, 8th March, 1855, referring to criticism about Lord Raglan and the Crimea, he wrote: "I thought it right to keep this record of what the Duke told me, as proof that the *will* at least to injure is never wanting in certain circles and that the gullibility of the public has no bounds."(In Eyck, 1959, p.226] We now move to the arrangement of the Exhibition itself, which was very much connected with those who organised it.

Arrangement and Ideas

The Exhibition itself was an embodiment of many of the ideas held about progress, civilisation and material and moral supremacy, (especially of Britain, despite Prince Albert's insistence on the all-nations aspect.)⁶ There were over 15,000 exhibitors and nearly one half were British. The exhibits were arranged both under countries and types and set out with the entrance in the South, Britain and her dominions in the West part, foreign goods in the East and machinery in the North of the building. The central avenue housed large exhibits from all countries and classes, including statues. Some large exhibits and raw materials were outside the Crystal Palace itself, arranged so that it was a trip from "lumps of ore to finished jewellery and household ornaments by progressive stages." [Hobhouse, 1937, p.70] Mayhew mentions how it emphasised "man's genius" to see raw materials, ("the cause of our power") and compare a lump of iron with the fine instruments made from it.

Playfair thought that Prince Albert's original idea for the classification of objects was too philosophical. These were:

1. The Raw Materials of Industry
2. The Manufactures made from them
3. The Art employed to adorn them.

[Reid, 1900, p.115-6]

Playfair saw problems in putting the categories into a practical system because he thought that all the classes ran into each other. Iron ore, for example, was the raw material for cast iron and cast iron was, itself, the raw material for all iron manufactures. Thus, he says "I prepared with great labour, a new classification by dividing manufactures into twenty-

nine classes, each of which were sub-divided into sub-sections representing the distinct industries."Reid, 1900, [p.116] He showed these to manufacturers in all his classes and revised them according to their suggestions. Thus, as the organisation progressed, Playfair could see if there were any gaps and write to the respective manufacturers to invite them. According to Playfair, "it produced a marked change in favour of the Exhibition"Reid, 1900, [p.116] which had been slow in gaining support. It was, he said, the first attempted classification of industrial work.

Playfair further drummed up support by touring the manufacturing districts, calling on leading industrialists and meetings with civic authorities, M.P.'s and manufacturers to explain the purpose of the Exhibition. This contact, and probably the fact that Playfair had himself worked in a Lancashire industry, lent an air of reality to the project. The manufacturers agreed with the purpose of the enterprise and Playfair's classification meant that divisions between products and goods were more specific and related to the reality of production. Each distinct manufacturer could show off his product in its distinct category: Class XV111 - Woven, Spun, Felted and Laid Fabrics, when shown as Specimens of Printing and Dying was distinct from Class XX - Articles of Clothing for Immediate Personal or Domestic Use. There is a full list of the divisions in Gibbs-Smith, [1964, p.14-15] It was so carefully planned that some classes, for example textiles, had fourteen sub-sections and some sub-sub-sections. The divisions were also the basis for the prize medals awarded and each country divided their exhibits into this system although some countries lacked those in the industrial categories. Portugal and Spain, for example, had mainly raw materials - "tons of copper, kegs of snuff and bushels of olives repelled the visitors." [Hobhouse, 1937, p.129]

The Indian section, however, was of great interest "to our great grandfathers ... (and) was half the fun of the whole show; they pored and gloated over the objects of brass and bamboo that had taken fifty-years to make." (Hobhouse, 1937, p106)

There was also a Fine Arts Court where sculpture, but not painting, was allowed. (Painting was not deemed 'technical' enough for the Exhibition. Sculpture, however, necessitated the use of 'tools'.) Hobhouse describes the sculpture as being 'by the ton' and that it made the flesh creep; it was life size, but lifeless.[p.106] Many of the statues were nude females in chains and drapery in languid poses with one leg lightly bent and the other slightly forward giving a certain coyness. One of these was 'The Greek Slave', by Hiram Powers,(U.S.A.). She is about to be sold off to a man in the bazaar and her head is cast down. In common with other similar statues, (for example 'Phryne', by J. Pradier and 'Andromeda', cast from a design by John Bell,) they have no expressions at all. One writer likens them to nude females at car shows nowadays.[J. Allwood, 1977, p.211] 'The Greek Slave' was one of the most popular exhibits and whereas Hobhouse says that the Exhibition showed that the middle classes had gone "bald-headed" for "nature, pathos, and moral purpose," , we are asked voyeuristically to witness the slave's degradation. The I.L.N., (Illustrated London News) wrote that the nudity was too self-conscious that the chains were not part of real history, but simply accessories. Thus, it reasoned, the denudation was not "genuine".[23.8.'51] Some Bishops also complained to Queen Victoria and wanted the statues covered up.[Boase, 1959, p.267] Boase sees the statues of the "damsels in distress" as a theme showing a mixture of sadism and chivalry which are confused. Of course, the "moral purpose" and beauty of the woman and the

technical details were the main considerations stated at the Exhibition.(Interestingly, a statue of 'Dorothea', from *Don Quixote*, by John Bell, shows a half-dressed woman, not from classical times, but much more modern and it was judged that "the artist incurs an amazing risk in combining the half-nude with positively frilled garments." For some illustrations see Gibbs-Smith, 1964, pp.128ff. 'An Amazon', by A. Kiss, from Prussia, was very popular, and shows a woman in fighting pose on horseback. This was also one of the most popular exhibits.) Of the major European countries that attended, France was felt to be ahead in many areas of manufacture. Hobhouse,[1937, p.126] attributes this to a long history of Government patronage, for example in tapestry and porcelain, and says their showing "shattered many insular complacencies." Although much of the politician's speechifying at the time of the Exhibition stressed the 'Brotherhood of Nations' theme', there was also a need for Britain to be seen as a foremost power. Beaver, [1970, p.12], describes the Exhibition as a huge shop window for a time when mass-marketing was difficult. The theme that recurs time and time again, however, is the necessity for Britain to compete worldwide and to work hard to maintain her lead.

The Art Journal [f.1846], had an Illustrated Catalogue published in connection with the Exhibition in 1851 and its Preface says:

But it is to the honour of Great Britain that notwithstanding the generous work incurred by inviting competitors from all the nations of the world - prepared as they had been by long years of successful study and practical experience - the fame of British manufacturers has been augmented by this contest and there can be no doubt that when his Royal Highness, Prince Albert, issues his summons in another competition, British supremacy will be manifested in every branch of industrial art,

Prince Albert himself, was anxious to stress the 'All Nations' aspect of the exhibition, announcing it as a platform for the interchange of ideas. Indeed, when the Commissioners were deciding what should be done with the surplus profit, Albert, Cole and Playfair were very keen for an educational institution for science and technology. In a letter to Playfair, C.B. Phipps, the Prince's Private Secretary, outlined Albert's views:

The surplus had, in fact, been collected from all nations, and justly and honestly claims a proprietary not less extended. In projecting, therefore, modes for the disposal of the surplus, the object must not be so much the founding of institutions through which Great Britain may be raised to an equality or maintain her superiority over other nations, as the foundation of some establishment in which, by the application of science and art to industrial pursuits, the industry of all nations may be raised in the scale of human employment.
[Reid, 1900, p.36 - Letter from Balmoral, dated September 27th, 1851]

Playfair, himself recognised the need for Britain to "keep foremost in the struggle with nations" but wrote that any institution founded should be in the interests of all nations. Albert's stress on this is probably, (like his speech on the abolition of slavery - see Bennett, p.85) sincere, but is also tied up with his own feelings of not being British. Even the *Art Journal* [Catalogue 185,1,xiv] notes that the Prince's admirers have done "less than justice to the very prominent part he has taken in this project ..." and we have noted that xenophobic feelings haunted him until the end.

Some of the propaganda by Protectionists against the Exhibition was quite blatant in its prejudices against 'the bearded foreigner'. One comic strip[Harvie et al, 1970, p.251ff] by Thomas B. Onwhyn, was called *"Mr. and Mrs. John Brown's visit to London to see the Grand Exposition of All Nations. How they were astonished at it's Wonders!! Inconvenienced by the*

Crowds and frightened out of their Wits by the Foreigners!" These included Chinese, Cossacks, Bedouins, Cannibals, Esquimaux - who feast on a tub of tallow and the Brown's were so alarmed they could not stay in London. As previously stated,[Chapter 2], the idea of the 'savage' was common in 19th Century England and also the idea of Progress. Perhaps the two most frequently used words in connection with the Exhibition are 'civilisation' and 'progress'. Many of the foreign exhibits were seen as exotic, for example, the Indian textiles, and also were seen as 'primitive'. One commentator describes the attitudes of the people at this time:

...wealthy, respectable mid-Victorians became more competitive in the search for gentle positions in a new urban aristocracy, they also became more exclusive in their attitudes. Physical features identified even the most refined of black gentlemen with a savage heritage and a slave past. At the same time the urban gentry found a convenient substitute for the family or blood relationship of the traditional aristocracy in a common identity as members of the Anglo-Saxon race. A white skin became one essential quality of a gentleman. Blacks, regardless of the individual's social accomplishments, were lumped together in one category, excluded from the ranks of gentlemen and identified with the residuum, the very social group respectable mid-Victorians most feared and the social stratum in which they most frequently encountered blacks within Britain.
[Douglas A. Lorrimer, 1977]

These attitudes were also a part of Liberal, pro-Empire Playfair's views. On a trip to America in 1877, he went to a fair held by Black people. With the tone of an amusing anecdote, he describes what he saw in a tent for 'religionists':

The sermon ... was ended by a stalwart negro woman beginning to jump frantically ... The jumping woman at last fell down exhausted, and then began to groan horribly. The lot of darkies knelt round her, and began to sing at the tops of their voices ... These lunatics went dancing and clapping their hands ... the whole camp became so excited that I thought it better to be off, as some of the negro women looked as if they would favour me with their ecstatic embraces. The whole affair is the dancing epidemic of the Middle Ages, still existing

among the negroes, I thought all this had died out, but it is still to be found among the old slaves,
[Reid, 1900, p.256-7]

Again, in 1878, Playfair dined at St. Stephen's Club among a party of clergymen. He says:

"Looking out for a layman, I saw a desperately black negro with superb white teeth ... He spoke perfect English and was quite a gentleman,"[Reid, 1900, p.281] (He turns out to be the King of Bonny having come to Britain to get some 'civilisation' and introduce it to his backward subjects. Because he asked about 'the microphone' and 'the phonograph', he was 'obviously a most enlightened leader'.)

These ideas penetrated and informed politics and economics and also educational and intellectual fields. There is an interesting quote from the *Journal of the Anthropological Society* [V11, 1869, in Lorrimer, 1977], which also illustrates something of this:

...If only those in authority would take the trouble to make themselves acquainted with certain race distinctions - in fact, become anthropologists - there would be fewer political mistakes than ruled at present; and less pandering to Negroes, the working classes and the Celtic Irish ...

Linked as they are to ideas about Britain's place in 'civilisation' and in the forward march of industrial and scientific progress, such conceptions were a part of the visions of those organising the Great Exhibition. The Exhibition certainly had a profound effect on one man, Henry Christy [1810-64], who was a banker and "started travelling in 1850 in foreign countries to study their characteristics and in 1851, the Great Exhibition powerfully influenced his mind and he began the study of the primitive habits of and customs of uncivilised tribes." [M.W. Thompson, 1977. From A.H. Lane-Fox, *Catalogue of the Anthropological Collection* lent by Colonel Lane-Fox. London, 1874, p.xiii, who later changed his name to Pitt Rivers.

Thompson uses a hyphen.] In the nineteenth century 'primitive' was often used synonymously with 'savage' and yet one of the nearest exhibits to approximate this idea, was the model of Indian village life showing various people at work, for example, a laundress. (When the Crystal Palace was set up later in Sydenham, it had modelled 'life-size' scenes of 'primitives'.) Pitt-Rivers said The Exhibition 'powerfully influenced' the mind of Christy so it can be supposed that it was the general layout and ideas that stimulated his actions. Many colonies and what were considered less 'civilised' countries were represented. Trinidad, for example, had mostly raw materials and natural produce and 'not many manufactured articles.' [Hobhouse, 1937, p.130] The *ILN* [5.7.51] commented that the Indian and aboriginal cottages in the West Indian collection "... are very rude and essentially savage, displaying, however, much of that neathandedness which savages often possess ..." The New Zealand exhibit of a fort prompted a statement about how similar they were to modern fortifications. The fact that "civilised" *and* "savage" people use similar principles shows that common sense prevails. And such ideas, again, illustrate a particular view of progress and being civilised. Tunis had one exhibitor who presided over a display presented like a shop with carpet and so forth. There was a visible scale, it was not simply that Great Britain excelled in machinery, but this idea of 'Progress' is also reflected in the pride of ownership. Du Mare notes that England displayed India's goods including jewels, with a sense of pride. (1973, p67)

Much has been written about the aftermath and results of the Exhibition, including the developments in South Kensington. Altick, [1978, p.467], describes how the Exhibition, which attracted such big crowds, increased attendances at other 'tourist attractions', for example Windsor

Castle and other London art galleries. Ms Short, [1966, p.199] and C.R. Fay, [1951, p.93-4] note the good business done by excursion trains, 'The Exhibition ... marks an important stage in the evolution of modern British travel ... Thomas Cook ... won his spurs as an organiser of tourist traffic ... as the agent of the Midland Railway for the management of the excursion trade.'

We have already noted how there was concern about the behaviour of the working classes along with fears about revolutionary foreigners. When the *First Report of the Commissioners* came out, there was an *Appendix on the Working Classes* [Short, 1966, p.202 - pp.111-126 of the Report] in which they were praised for their conduct. It was seen that crime had decreased and that of the arrests made, they were for drunkenness, which was, as it said, a failing of the labouring classes when they celebrated anything. (Of the crimes, eleven people were caught removing minor exhibits, twelve pickpockets were caught stealing £4. 5s.3d and they were given £90 of false money at the door - Hobhouse, 1937, p.143) The idea of exhibitions and art galleries as places of social showing off was not a novel one in 1851. John Ward noted how Josiah Wedgewood and his partner opened an Exhibition room in Greek Street, Soho, which became a "fashionable lounging place, and tended greatly to the extension of their sales, and to the introduction of the partners to the notice of men of rank, fortune and science." (1843, p434)

Hyde Park, the scene of the Great Exhibition, was already a familiar meeting place. William Ewart wrote in 1848 that he rode there as it was "a *certain* plan for meeting acquaintances" in the season.[W.A. Munford, 1960, p.175-6] He helped his daughter "come out" in 1851, taking her to theatres, opera, balls, parties and "to the Great Exhibition without

stint." This is highlighted in an article in *ILN* [19.7.51] which attempted to define class in terms of the 5 shilling and 1 shilling days and the appearance and habits of the respective types. Each day, we are told, shows a "distinct train of appendages and characteristics." The St. James' of the 5 shilling day ate "vanille, ices and wafers", but the 1 shilling St. Giles' represented the day of huge crusts and lumps of meat washed down by drink in bottles. Their sandwiches were not "Vauxhall sandwiches" and pie and cold pudding were wrapped in "greasy newspaper." The bundle was stuffed into a handkerchief or basket. The 1 shilling day person's lunch was accompanied by "A great untying of handkerchiefs and distribution of viands and strange whiffs of rum and gin, borne upon wandering zephyrs." It was amusing, thought the *ILN* to watch the thorough enjoyment of their "Brobdignag sandwiches. Dress also distinguished the 1 shilling and 5 shilling visitor; the former's was coarser. Behaviour, too, differentiated. The St. James', who came from the West End, displayed no eagerness, no "fluttter of curiosity" which was partly due to the fact that they had made numerous visits until "interrupted" by the 1 shilling folk. There was "languid lounging and chatting" and it was not the aisles and galleries that were crowded but the *nave*. People looked at other people and asked "whether they will meet other people at balls and operas in the evening."

The St. Giles', however, come from "all the other ends of the earth" to the West End. The aisles and galleries are crowded with the nave used as throughfare and there is "resolute examining and frank amazement." The writer admires the "energetic business-like march" of the 1 shilling folk, notes their eager anticipation and says that they first go to the part

connected with their own trade. Mrs. St. Giles, however, has her doubts about the statues such as 'The Greek Slave.'

The various plans about how to spend the £186,000 surplus were governed by the desire to promote science and art and their application to industry using exhibitions and lectures.[Details are in Reid, 1900, p.130ff and Crowther 1965, p.197] It was hoped to connect London with provincial centres and Mechanics' Institutes. Prince Albert was particularly keen for ...'*ocular observation*, comparison and demonstration' as a part of learning. [Reid, 1900, p.131. From a memorandum written by Albert sketching his ideas about the surplus]. With an additional grant from the House of Commons, (£150,000), and was purchased in South Kensington, (87 acres were bought and at that time the land consisted mainly of fields and lanes with only a few houses.) Today, the legacy of all this is the Victoria and Albert Museum, The Science Museum, Natural History Museum, Geological Museum and a teaching institution, The Imperial College of Science and Technology. There is also the Royal College of Art and that of Music.² Such developments following the Great Exhibition are discussed in the following section and are linked to ideas expressed in the Select Committee of 1835 about the links between art and industry.[See also Chapter 5]

Some Outcomes of 1851

The Commission of 1851 became a permanent entity and in 1853 the Department of Science and Art was formed, which later came under the aegis of the Education Department,(previously it had come under the Board

of Trade), Playfair was Secretary and Cole Inspector General. This reformation of "our education so as to fit it for the increasing competition of the world", [Reid, 1900, p.149 - part of Playfair's autobiography] included the first museum of industrial art housed in what was known as the Brompton Boilers - a temporary place built in 1856.² As Playfair says, the art section of the department took off quicker than the science because there were more existing schools of design that could be adapted to schools of art, than there were science institutions. Of the latter, there were only two, one in Manchester and the other in Glasgow.

The Commissioners had been presented with many of the exhibits from the Great Exhibition and it was these that formed the "nucleus" of a collection at the South Kensington Museum (now the V and A).³ According to Playfair, it was:

...the greatest museum of its kind in the world. In the presents referred to there were numerous specimens of raw materials, especially of grains and other alimentary substances. These were used to form "The Food Collection," which has been so much visited by the working classes. It is now at Bethnal Green. It would have been useless to display the analyses of various foods in statistical tables which no one would read, so I tried the experiment of showing the actual ingredients in a pound of food. Thus, 1lb. of maize was divided into so much flesh-forming materials, so much woody fibre, water, fat, sugar, gum, starch, etc., so that the eye could at once observe the quantities, while the results of the printed analysis could easily be copied if the visitor desired to do so. This system of instructional display is now followed in every museum, but at that time, 1850's, it was novel,

" (Reid, 1900, p150)

Thus, the educational aspects of the 1851 exhibits was shown and for Playfair, it was to include students, specialists and the public. The museum also sent loans to the provinces. When Hanley museum and library was opened in 1887, it received a loan of paintings, ceramics and

metalwork from the South Kensington Museum.(J. Wilkinson, 1980, p.91)

Some of the Commissioners later activities included an Exhibition of National Portraits (1866-8), a Loan Collection of Scientific Instruments and Apparatus(1876), The Inventions Exhibition (1885), and the Colonial and Indian Exhibition (1886). Later, in the 1890's, Science Research scholarships were set up for post-graduates, work which continued into the twentieth century.

Playfair would not have liked the later description of the museum by Hobhouse, who says caustically:

Here, on the one side, are all the trumpery flotsam of learning, stuffed animals and fossils, stuck into glass cases and labelled in the hope of filling some vacant mind. And here on the other side, are some of the loveliest things on earth, whole rooms of English furniture ... - here they are, snatched from the hands of private men, sterilised, caged together in tasteless surfeit, imprisoned without hope of release. Here, too, perhaps the saddest of all, is a great staff of experts - unhappy custodians, bound by hated necessity to the prisoners of their great seraglio, yet pleased with a gloating pleasure that other men cannot get near them to enjoy them ... Domestic servants make assignments among the period panelled rooms, And on Bank Holiday, when it is wet outside, quite a lot of people go.

(Hobhouse, 1937, p157)

For Cole, however, and those involved in choosing exhibits for South Kensington, the exhibits were not 'snatched from the hands of private men' but were chosen for their use in teaching and demonstrating principles of design. According to Ames, the Exhibition created a feeling of alarm in the organisers about what was seen as "profusion" in design.¹² Whereas a few writers, such as du Mare, see this as a function of Victorian naivete and innocence, others denigrate Victorian 'taste'. Hobhouse, describing the furniture at the Exhibition with its mass of figurative and nature carving, comments that "every table was supported on the back of some ill-used animal." It is well known that Ruskin

and Morris disapproved of the objects at the Exhibition and in his *Life of William Morris*, J.W. MacKail says that 'ugliness and vulgarity reigned unchecked.' [From M. Lohead, quoted in Hobhouse, 1937, *The Victorian Household* p.170]. One writer describes the 1850's as "the nadir of taste"¹³ and says that the Victorians did not lack taste, "the trouble was that they had so much of it, and so much of that was bad." [Hobhouse, 1937, p.31]

Ames (1967) is more cautious on the subject. He notes that although the Exhibition did not fulfil its grand intentions - peace, brotherhood etc., it did help to propagate the Gothic style (through Pugin's mediaeval room) and it did lead to "an increased appetite for ornament," [p.88] However, even though many of the "show pieces" were admired and reproduced in the official catalogue, they should not be taken as typical. As Ames says, "It is impossible to dispose of mid-Victorian design as merely bad taste and eclecticism; we are barely beginning to look clearly at the huge body of evidence." [p.89]

It was, however, felt by many contemporary observers that the public needed to be educated to have better taste or sense of design. Cole believed it was better to educate the public rather than artisans, who would never be employed by a public which was uneducated. It is from this idea of Cole's that "...springs in large part the museum-education feature of the work in South Kensington ..." [Ames, 1967, p.92. The principles of the 1835 Arts and Manufactures Select Committee about *public* education were re-stated and "realised". See Chapter 5 above]

Ideas about taste were often linked to those about manufacture. In an optimistic article in *Art-Union* [1st March 1848], W. Cooke Taylor recognises that the artist and manufacturer have become separate people

but that they can and "should be drawn together in mutual alliance." He is keen to emphasise that there is nothing "derogatory to the highest Art in lending its aid to decorate objects of utility ... Artists are public teachers ..." Further, the tendency towards reproduction and multiplication of copies have wrought "a wonderful change in tastes and habits of the people ..." The rich and aristocratic can possess originals the public can have a copy and gain in education, while the value of the original is not lost.

This idea of the marriage of 'high' art and manufacture, did not take account of the worker. Klingender, commenting on the division of labour, says that it debased both design and those who were no longer craftsmen but wage labourers. Technical innovation and competition led to large scale production of goods, cheapness became the major aim and therefore quality was sacrificed.¹⁴ The wage labourers were now among the market aimed at and they were people whose 'sense of design' had been destroyed.

"But as 'taste' became the exclusive attribute of an ever narrower circle of specialists, the appreciation of design vanished as rapidly among the middle and upper classes as among the workers. Hence the salesman's search for indications of public 'taste' became a scramble for 'selling points',
[Ames, 1967, p.40]

Klingender (1975) saw Victorian taste - "parlours and drawing-rooms stuffed with bric-a-brac," - as the furnishing of a retreat from the contradiction of the position of the upper and middle classes. This was that although "Appalled by the industrial landscape," they were also "enriched by the squalor it engendered." [p.41] Arthur Elton, who edited and revised Klingender's work, believes the latter would certainly have

revised his opinions on Victorian taste and culture had he been writing at a later date than 1946-7. Recent research has shown that mechanisation produced popular art which, according to Elton, is as 'vigorous and attractive' as peasant art. Interestingly, he says:

With its soaring nave and transepts of iron and glass, the Crystal Palace of 1851, one of the great architectural monuments of Britain, was at once the product of mass production and standardisation, and a reflection of popular taste,"
[p.4. He goes on to say that often Victorian details, for example on cast iron objects, had a 'functional beauty.' For a list/description of 'popular art' objects, see G.S. Fletcher, *Popular Art in England* London '62.]⁵

From descriptions of the Crystal Palace, it can be seen that there is a resemblance to popular art forms. The interior in particular, with its colour scheme, showed well defined lines and brightness. (The glazing bars were in white and the girders in light blue, the undersides of the girders were in red and yellow was used on some of the diagonal uprights.) Mayhew's description could equally apply to the later music halls, gin palaces and department stores, inside it was "a visual feast and rare delight of air, colour, and space." If the building itself was "astonishing," with its mass-produced parts, so were "the endless avenues ... filled with such a richness of colour and variety of scale that the exhibits melted into tiny components of a vast mosaic." [Hobhouse, 1937, p.143] The colours were "brilliant" and "festive," [Ames, 1967, p.88] the effect of which is, according to one writer, a "world of unreality and excitement." [Fletcher, 1962, p.12] For Ruskin, however, the building was little more than a big 'greenhouse' which showed ingenuity and vastness which had effect on "the popular imagination." It was simply not architecture, as far as he was concerned, (he resented the fact that

Turner, who died in 1851, had been ignored and yet such attention and finance had been given to the Exhibition.)(See Harvie et al - Eds. 1970, p.297, from *The Opening of The Crystal Palace* p.296ff). He uses the example of the Crystal Palace to attack what he sees as misdirected cultural priorities and deplores that "Our taste ... is dazzled by the lustre of a few rows of panes of glass ..." Although Ruskin may have held views that did not coincide with the ideas of the Exhibition organisers, manufacturers and staff at the School of Design, he did believe, as did they, in the general educative function of museums in relation to public taste.¹⁶

Its newly formed schools of art, its extending galleries, and well ordered museums will assuredly bear some fruit in time, and give once more to the popular mind the power to discern what is great, and the disposition to protect what is precious. But it will be too late, We shall wander through our palaces of crystal, gazing sadly on copies of pictures torn by cannon-shot, and on casts of sculpture dashed to pieces long ago,

(Harvie et al - Eds. 1970, p303)

Taste, it was believed, could be educated. Those at the School of Design saw this as their task. Ames discusses the eclectic tastes of various strata of the middle class. The motto of this optimistic taste was "take your pick."(Ames, 1967, p.30) It was the taste of people who believed in the present and the future. They could use the styles of the past in their Roman and Greek revival reform clubs with their plush and aristocratic interiors, but they enjoyed the social and economic order of their time. The latter, in London, were for Civil Service men, Lawyers, Dons, Doctors, Officers and so forth, who were patriots and who would not have been out of place on the Commission or Committees of 1851. The working classes would have had less scope in which to operate choice over the matter of

architectural or decorative styles produced by manufacturing industry. Their world was one in which very little was thrown away, furniture would, like clothes, have been handed down or sold in second hand shops. There is another sphere of education, apart from and yet connected to, South Kensington, within which the Great Exhibition extended its ideas. It registered in the mind of a young officer who developed a system relating to material culture. The biographer of Lieutenant General Augustus Henry Lane Fox Pitt Rivers, (to give him his full title) believes that Pitt Rivers began to collect muskets at the time of the Exhibition.[M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.112] Thompson says:

The Great Exhibition produced a strong consciousness of material progress and a theory which sought to elucidate this apparently relentless progress - as did the series of Fox - and had a decided relevance to the contemporary world. He arranged his weapons or muskets in a series showing a system, the gradual improvement and development of the form, which could of course be extended to all branches of material culture. It demonstrated the underlying principles of material progress of which the culmination in many fields was to be seen in the Crystal Palace.
[p.21]

We will now describe the implications of this, not only on Pitt-Rivers, but also in general.

Pitt-Rivers and Progress

Pitt-Rivers was born in 1827 into landed aristocracy. Like his father, he was to have a military career, serving in the Crimea. He was a self-taught man to a large extent and also had numerous important connections. He married Alice, daughter of Lord Edward John and Lady

Henrietta-Maria Stanley. Her grandmother had entertained Caryle and John Stuart Mill in the '40's and '50's and her father was a Conservative, holding Office as President of the Board of Trade and Postmaster General. He "almost certainly" influenced Pitt-Rivers' military career.[M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.19-20. Pitt-Rivers would also have known of Egerton a friend of the Stanley's, who collected fossil fish, and of Albertway, married to Alice's aunt, who was Director of the Society of Antiquities. He sponsored Pitt-Rivers' Fellowship of the Royal Society of Antiquities, 1863.] In the late '50's, Pitt-Rivers became familiar with the Royal United Service Institution, which had one of the most extensive ethnographic collections in Britain. It was here that he lectured on the rifle,[58] and bullets,[61], but by the late '60's, Pitt-Rivers was giving talks on ethnography. Thompson notes that his rifle lecture contained one phrase worth repeating, referring to his belief that "necessity, rather than foresight, has been the mother of invention ."[p.28] He had tested the musket while in service and had tried to improve it. In tracing the history of its development, he believed that, though various ways had been tried in the past, that only a few serve "as links in the chain of progress," the other attempts "have branched out of the main line and contributed nothing of permanent utility." Having read Darwin when first published in November 1859, Pitt-Rivers is obviously applying ideas of natural selection to his ideas about material culture.[See *Journal of the Ethnological Society*, ns.1, 1869, p.65]. It is known that he was associated with Sir John Lubbock who later married his daughter and that Lubbock had studied under Darwin. Pitt-Rivers also knew Huxley, staunch defender of Darwin. Lubbock married Pitt-Rivers' daughter in 1882, after being widowed, and we know that in 1878 Playfair mentions his enjoyable stays

with the Lubbocks.[See Reid, 1900, p.273 and 264]. He was also on at least one select committee with Lubbock.. It is unclear whether Pitt-Rivers and Playfair actually met, although Lubbock and Playfair would surely have associated during the '80's as they were both prominent Liberal politicians. Pitt-Rivers, however, would have heard of Playfair and earlier have seen his cataloguing of the Great Exhibition. Pitt-Rivers belonged to the Ethnological Society of London in the 1860's (which had split and was reunited with the Anthropological Society in 1870) and he was only one of a number of military men who were interested in ethnology. The first three lectures he gave (of six during 1874-5, at the Anthropological Institute), were on Primitive Warfare from pre-human through the Stone Age, to the age when metal was used. He identified three instincts, basically - food, sex and 'combateness' which served as a protection of the species and a sifting out of the fittest. Warfare can therefore, be explained in terms of natural selection as can the weapons used. Both strategy and means progress together. He uses the term 'savage', linking their use of weapons to the natural defences of animals, (for example, piercing weapons).

It is interesting to note that the Great Exhibition's exhibit of guns, which would have interested Pitt-Rivers, were "a fine selection of aggressive weapons" -[see Gibbs-Smith, 1964, p.48-51] There was also a 12/- rifle designed for "barter with the African native, side by side with a different model for the purpose of shooting him down."[ibid] This was alongside slave chains and shackles produced in Birmingham for export to America.) While serving in Ireland during the 1860's, Pitt-Rivers acted in an intelligence capacity, on the look-out for Feman conspiracy. He saw the situation "as a war of races indeed."[M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.114 & 134.

From *Catalogue of Pitt Rivers' Papers* in the Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum - Forthcoming, Thompson, Ed.] His lectures are the main body of his theoretical work and these ideas even early on, were not confined to his interest in ethnography.

By 1874, his own collection was too big for his house and until 1878, went to the Bethnal Green section of the South Kensington Museum. From 1878-84, it was in the main museum and was added to by Pitt-Rivers. It was a private collection in a public museum.[M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.37] When it opened there was a special meeting of the Anthropological Institute in the Museum where he read a paper outlining his ideas on classification:

The collection does not contain ... unique specimens, and has been collected ... solely with a view to instruction. For this purpose, ordinary and typical specimens, rather than rare objects, have been selected and arranged in sequence, so as to trace, as far as practicable, the succession of ideas by which the minds of men in a primitive condition of culture have progressed from the simple to the complex, and from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous.
[Beatrice Blackwood, 1974, p.3-4]

Although Pitt-Rivers was confident of his theory of an evolutionary sequence for material culture, (which represented ideas), he was aware that "...continuity, in relation to the arts, can scarcely yet be said to be established as a science." [M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.37. From J.L. Myres Ed. *The Evolution of Culture and other Essays by the late Lt. Gen. A. Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers*, Oxford, 1906] Darwin had based his work, said Pitt-Rivers, on long collections of materials and if it could be done with geology or natural history, it could also be done with material culture. M.W. Thompson notes how this 'desire to find objects to fit into series and sequences ...' had sometimes overridden the examination of sites that

Pitt-Rivers excavated. This was rectified to some extent, when he gave his collection to Oxford University in 1884, (where it is housed in a part of the National History Museum, designed by Ruskin.) He had offered it to the authorities for retention at South Kensington, but it was refused "on the grounds that it was an ethnological collection and that the British Museum, not South Kensington, dealt with ethnology." [p.38] Although Pitt-Rivers argued that it was a sequence showing the development of the arts and the committee set up to consider it (including Huxley and Lubbock), wanted it accepted, the Government refused. The collection consisted of four parts:

1. Skulls and hair
2. Weapons
3. Miscellaneous art of modern savages, including early modes of navigation.
4. Pre-historic series.

Although M.W. Thompson says that it has 'altered out of all recognition' [1977, p.38] it is still possible to see the imprint of Pitt-Rivers ideas. The museum itself professes to carrying on their founders comparative techniques with regard to prehistoric tools of Europe, Africa and Asia and the more recent tools of societies 'discovered' by Europeans. Whereas Pitt-Rivers would have compared individual tools, however, the Museum presents 'kits of tools' representing different societies at different times. He believed that history was evolution and like him the museum believes in his precept of comparing 'man as he was and as he is' and it still presents objects arranged by subjects (but with geographical area as a sub-group). Of course, this method of comparison can be used to illustrate an idea of progress as Pitt-Rivers and those of his time saw

it. Although his collection was 'to trace the succession of ideas,' he allowed that a really complete picture would include the geographical. [Blackwood, 1974, p.3-4. From Pitt-Rivers' speech, 1874 at the Anthropological Institute.] The museum had planned (before costs ruled it out) a new building on a circular scale in which you could walk around in circles and see the art and industry of different countries and compare them and from the centre outwards, where different segments represented different countries. (They still hope to bring in a modified and less costly version of this plan.) Curators of the Pitt-Rivers Museum have added to the collections over the years. Mr. Lewis Balfour, the son of one curator, gave his father's collection of musical instruments which is a series in accordance with the founder's principles. (This collection has increased from 15,000 to over one million.)

If we look closely at Pitt-Rivers' method of comparison, a number of flaws become apparent. In his 1875 lecture, (reproduced in M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.136ff), he closely compares representatives of the human face on earthenware and stone found by Dr. Schliemann at Troy. He has arranged them in an order based on their design which he very confidently says proves that they represent human features - (Schliemann said that they were owls.) He says that because all types of design were found at different levels, "no argument as to antiquity can be based upon the depth they were found." This may be true, but he is so sure of his method that it cannot allow the simple to follow the complex. He also applies a detailed comparison of the ornamentation on the paddle blades of what he calls '...The New Irelanders, a race of Papuan savages...' ¹⁷ There is a very interesting line up, starting with a face progressing or degenerating into a crescent shape. (This process of 'realistic degeneration, he allies to

growth in the sophistication of societies leading to writing and language.)He says:

No one who compared this figure with the first of the series, without the explanation afforded by the intermediate links, would believe that it represented the nose of a human face, Unfortunately we do not know as yet the exact meaning of these designs but when further information is obtained it will throw considerable light on similar transformations in pre-historic times,

(Blackwood, 1974, p154)

He strongly insisted that artifacts or material culture were the roots of culture. Culture progressed towards civilization. He wished "to affirm the principle that it is by studying the psychology of the material arts alone that we can trace human culture to its germs." (A tool, he said, represented an idea, but he had no theory to encompass what an idea was, and how it may relate to material culture.)(Blackwood,1974,p156)

Further, for Pitt-Rivers, the branches of the evolutionary tree of material culture 'throw their branches upwards' and if some branches of culture degenerate - (for example, the history of myths,) the trunk is still an upward growth.

What was the material culture shown at the Great Exhibition? We have already described the comparative, competitive ideas of progress clinging to it and expressed by its prime movers. Some obvious similarities can be seen between Pitt-Rivers' ideas on the organization of his collection and that of Playfair's at the Exhibition. The latter was arranged geographically and by subject, and gave impressions of progression from raw to manufactured goods, and, advanced and not so advanced countries. It demonstrated what Pitt-Rivers called 'the reality of progress.'(M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.138) It also appears that, just as Britain displayed her Empires goods and took pride in their possession

and domination, so too, there is a comparable quality in the theories of Pitt-Rivers and the amassing of material culture from 'primitives.' This continued in the Museum after his death. In 1901, the first lecturer, Tyler, on the collection, bought the Museum's "most spectacular single exhibit - the forty foot high totem pole which once stood in front of a Haida Indian Chief's house in the village of Masset, Queen Charlotte Islands, British Columbia, and now dominates the Court of the Pitt-Rivers Museum."

Balfour, the Curator, (in 1891), also increased the collection "as a result of his own journeys to many then almost unknown parts of the world."

Despite increasing the collection from 15,000 to over 1,000,000 items, (some from other museums), the Honorary assistant curator, Beatrice Blackwood, writing in 1974, bemoans the apparant lack of ethnological materials:

It is sometimes said that the days of collecting ethnological specimens are over, and indeed opportunities for finding good material grow fewer as dwellers in the uttermost parts of the earth replace their hand made pots with petrol cans and their home woven fabrics with trade cloth,
[p.11]

This is not surprising when you consider the story of the American Indian. In a recent article on the Hopi and Navajo Indians, (*The Guardian*) Linda Blandford wrote about their mandatory relocation. She calls it a "tragedy" and contrasts the story with that of the Museum of the American Indian in New York, (established 1916.) The museum houses "some of the Hopis' and Navajos' greatest heirlooms and artifacts, as there are of other tribes form(sic) the Artic to the tip of South America." It was started by an oil millionaire's son, George Gustav Heye, whose large

personal collection is among the museums's million or so objects. Blandford says that Heye had a "mania" for collecting; "folklore has it that Heye would buy up whole Indian villages, leave the inhabitants naked, clutching money in their fists." He also went to auctions in America and abroad and sought out exhibits by touring towns. She says he did not collect in order to share his finds and that he was not interested in Indians as people, but that he did it because it "was his hobby" on which he spent 15 million dollars.

The museum has 35,000 visitors a year, a fraction of the nearby Natural History Museum and Blandford says this is because the former packs its exhibits together too "dryly." Various parties, a "computer software emperor of Dallas" and the Natural History Museum wish to take over the museum and New York City and State have offered to contribute a large sum. The collection is being treated as the heritage of the people of New York, but others argue it is *American* and could therefore, be moved to Dallas. Blandford, however, adds that "no one says that everything in the museum belonged once to the American Indian. Let alone, that it should again."

Apart from the influence that the Exhibition had on his ideas, Pitt-Rivers had many things in common with those who organised it. He was an aristocrat with a military career who was interested in scientific and intellectual matters. He was a conservative Conservative who had had political aspirations (he had stood unsuccessfully for the County Council, 1888-9) but he "had no aptitude for politics." (M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.85-6) He addressed the local Primrose League in 1888 where he said he deplored the interests of party before country:

This is an age of science and we should listen to the voice of scientific men; they are our instructors. They see the affairs of the world from a higher standpoint than political men who are merely wire pullers and self interested partisans. The proper function of conservatism is to serve as a check upon violent changes,

^{1e}(Thompson, 1977, p87)

E.B. Tylor made an interesting point - [*Primitive Culture* II, 1871, p.410, quoted by Burrows, 1977, p.254] when he says "the science of culture is essentially a reformer's science." It was to provide a practical guide to understanding the present and future and thus, he felt, the study of civilisation's origins and development had to continue. Burrow argues that Tylor's idea of reform is moral and intellectual. It is this that links him to Pitt-Rivers who was a Tory who believed in education (his Museum and interest in the Primrose League.) This can also be seen as a link between such as Pitt-Rivers to other 19th Century reformers. People like Ewart and Playfair shared a similar view of progress and social *development* although it is true that Pitt-Rivers was "less interested in society than in artifacts." (Thompson, 1977, p.181) People like Peel, Playfair and Prince Albert would not have disagreed with Pitt-Rivers' description of the role of science. Increasingly science became identified with progress, but Crowther, in the Introduction to *Statesman of Science* describes how belief in private enterprise and political economy held back even those politicians who were interested in scientific advancement from advocating state support. For many industrialists, Capital worked on profits and wanted results that were fairly immediate. It was, however, an attitude that cut across the political spectrum of political economy. Briefly, even after the Department of Science and Art was founded, (mostly on private money), it had to struggle, according to Musgrave, "to impose its idea of technical instruction on the economic system." However, the 1867 Paris

Exhibition caused enough trepidation for parliament to appoint a Select Committee on Technical Instruction under a well known ironmaster, Bernhard Samuelson." [Musgrave, 1976, p.34] Again, the impetus of competition as seen at a big exhibition stimulated action.

Crowther notes another factor helping to further scientific organisation (also the Exhibition) that is, not only the military experience of those involved, but also the connections with India where, "they dealt with large administrative problems, which were more detached from immediate commercial considerations than comparable problems in Britain." (Crowther, 1965, p4)

Looking back over the events of the Exhibition, we see that there was still alarm about the dangers that the working classes might pose. It seemed to come mainly from London and although it could be said that this was because the Exhibition was *in London*, there had been provincial exhibitions of a similar type. Middle class industrialists from outside London had also witnessed working class attempts at self-improvement through Mechanic's Institutes and were perhaps more familiar with the working classes who would have to the Exhibition from outside London. Of course the working class of London would have gone, but they too were outsiders, just as (but not to the same degree) the 'bearded foreigner' was seen as a threat. From 1841 onwards, however, (S. Ctte on National Monuments) Select Committee witnesses had spoken of the good behaviour of 'the people' at museums and galleries (see Ch 5 above). The questions were often posed by people like Ewart to prove this point and therefore there were a number of people (Prince Albert too, as President of the Fine Arts Commission) who had some evidence prior to 1851, that the 'lower orders' could behave themselves in an exhibition environment. Mr

Labouchere (who had spoken for Ewart's 1845 Museum Bill (H. 78, 6.3.45, pp. 392-4), supported the ideas of the 1835 and '36 Arts and Manufactures Select Committees, spoken in Parliament to support the 1850 Museum and Library Act (H, 13.3.50, pp. 844-5), and later sat on the 1852-3 Select Committee on The National Gallery) an 1851 Commissioner, praised the behaviour of the people but did not express surprise. The following quote could be expressing *relief*, but rather it expresses that former trust has been vindicated. The ILN reported that:

Mr Labouchere thought the effect of The Exhibition would be productive of the greatest benefits to trade as well as to science, and the best interests of morality ... he was ... delighted at seeing the orderly demeanour of the hundreds of thousands of visitors to the Exhibition; and ... although the streets were crowded with foreigners ... the public peace had never been broken, (2,8,51)

The other side of the same coin was when the worst did *not* happen, how to get the working classes *to go* and it took a lot of organisation from the top downwards to ensure that they did attend. They proved interested in the machinery and the spectacle (but we should not assume that the latter was entirely the draw for the working classes - the music hall attracted the middle classes, especially later on). The novelty of such a big enterprise in a new type of building (indeed people used to pay to watch the building of the Palace) was itself an attraction. For Sir Matthew Digby Wyatt (Sec., of the Executive Committee) the building represented "the present industrial position of England." The Crystal Palace was a mixture of beauty and utility and the building firm "a model of the commercial constitution necessary to produce such great works with rapidity." It brought together science, commerce and legal knowledge with the heads of the firm being the "intellectual motive force" setting the

foremen into operation. The whole is a machine in which "The labour of the artisan, skilled in his own department, profoundly ignorant in others, is brought into useful operation." [Klingender, 1975, p.144-5, from Vol I of the *Illustrated Catalogue*, pp. 49-50] Thus the principles of mass production were embodied.

More than this, the Exhibition was thought to show not only a respect for labour but the success of Britain's economic and political system. Class harmony (see *The Economist* 3rd May, 1851 re., 'The Great Exhibition', Short, 1966, p.202) said more about Britain's political than military or commercial success and the 'foreigners' could compare this with their own systems. There was also the creation of a feeling of a common 'we' based on nationality and race. There is a certain irony in the fact that during the construction of the Crystal Palace, there was a strike amongst the workforce of glaziers who threatened to destroy all the glass already framed if their wages were not doubled (Nov. 1850). When the police were called in, the 'ringleaders' were arrested and the strike put down. All the strikers were sacked and nearly 1,500 French hands were taken on out of the 2,000 workers. [Short, 1966, p.196] This is glossed over in most accounts. The division of labour was organised so that 18,000 panes were fixed in a week by 80 men. [Klingender, 1975, p.145]

The Exhibition has been described as "The Exhibition of exhibitions, the most lavish of shows, the apotheosis of the lofty ideal of 'rational entertainment.'" [Altick, 1978, p. 456] One observer explained that:

People don't go there to study, but to be amused. If amusement brings instruction, all the better; if not - why instruction must wait for another day. Do you require proof of this proposition? Go into the lecturing theatre, and see how many people are there.
[ILN, 2,8,51]

This statement could be referring to the British Museum or the National Gallery. In this way, and in ideas of progress and civilisation, the Great Exhibition is inextricably linked to the formation of museums in Britain. In the next chapter we will look at the attempts to create local museums and the issues and debates surrounding the role and development of the museum in Britain.

Notes

- [1] There was *some* criticism of the 1s a day. *The Illustrated London News* [ILN] 2.8.51. said that for a man and his family the cost, plus loss of earnings, would amount to nearly half his weekly wage and 'the richest would shrink from such a sacrifice, if they had to make it in proportion to their means.' The large crowds, however, would ensure that the 1s cost would not be reduced.
- [2] The public were those with season tickets. Their sale soared to nearly 25,000 when it was announced these could go to the opening ceremony. Mr. Sandbays "made up his mind to invest five pieces of the lawful and current coin of Great Britain in the purchase of a brace of admission tickets" H. Mayhew and G. Cruickshank (1851, p. 139) Also - "After a series of visits first to Mr. Sams the librarian, thence to the Society of Arts in John Street, and thence to the office of the Executive Committee, Christopher was at least permitted, as a special favour, to convert his five socvreigns into two small pieces of paste-board, entitling himself and his wife to the right of admission to the Crystal Palace throughout the season." (p.196) Thus, it could prove very difficult to gain a place at the opening ceremony.
- [3] *Uncle Tom's Cabin* had been published in England in 1852 and had "probably the greatest short-term sale of any book in nineteenth-century England." (Altick, 1957, p. 384)
- [4] He had worked in Lancs. calico printing works for two years before his inquiry at Clithero but was still shocked at the conditions. See Reid, 1890, pp. 53ff.
- [5] Playfair later helped Forster with the 1870 Education Act.
- [6] See W.A. Munford (1960, pp.123ff) for an account of the peace movement in Europe. Its first Convention was held in London in 1843 and the final meeting attracted 2,000. Ewart, M.P., got involved in

1848 at the Brussels Peace Congress where the Congress resolved to support disarmament and an end to war. In 1851 the Congress met in London and the Exhibition attracted crowds to the Exeter Hall meetings. Attendance over the three days averaged 4,000. The peace movement, however, petered out soon after; Napoleon staged a coup d'etat and the Crimean War loomed. The presence of such a movement, however, does suggest that some politicians who pushed for educational reform (eg., Ewart at the S. Cttes of 1835 and '36 and the 1845 and '50 Bills for Museums and Libraries) for which they used arguments about Britain's industrial competitiveness, also had ideals of 'brotherhood' with other nations.

- [7] The ILN 17.3.51 said "John Bull is no longer an ogre but a genial and courteous gentleman."
- [8] Originally Prince Albert wanted the R.A. and the National Gallery on the S. Kensington site, See Reid, 1890, p. 141, and Ames, p. 97.
- [9] For a description of this corrugated sheet iron and glass building, see Ames, 1967, p124-5)
- [10] The committee also bought works from the Exhibition - see Ames, 1967, pp. 97-8. These included "Tunisian and Asiatic work; Belgian goldsmiths' and silversmiths' exhibits, Elkington electrotypes after Cellini, Turkish and other Eastern arms and armour, Minton and Sèvres China, English carpets ..."
- [11] Playfair was also happy that "the temperance societies look upon this subject warmly. Thus, when we showed how much water and spirits were in a gallon of alcoholic drinks, and how were the nutritive materials even in beer, the cause of temperance received more support than from any number of lectures. Ultimately this food museum led to a demand for schools of cookery, which have proved beneficial to the working classes." Reid 1890, p. 151.
- [12] An article in *The Journal of Design and Manufactures* Jan 1852, pleads for simplicity. The "rightness" of taste of which the Exhibition is a "good exponent" is now, it says, a "generally admitted" mistake.
- [13] Klingender, 1975, p. 43, says that this reaction was also true of the 'Art for Art's sake' position of Oscar Wilde and together they represent a "way out" by retreating into "earlier modes of work and thought."
- [14] When Playfair was working in Clitheroe he believed mass production was the only way forward - "I had not been in these works above a year when I saw that they were doomed, unless Mr. Thomson entirely changed the character of his works, ... to produce for the millions instead of the few ... His products were known all over Europe for their high excellence and he could not bear to lower their character or quality." Reid, 1890, p. 54.

- [15] There is "a modern day replica" of the Crystal Palace in Dallas which is a computer mart. Linda Blandford, *The Guardian*, (6.2.85) describes how Dallas is becoming scattered with examples of architecture from the past, She says, "How odd to find here the apogee of Empire without so much as a quirk of irony."
- [16] Ames, 1967, pp.95-6, said that Ruskin represented 'fine art' and the others, eg., Grace, Wallis and Whytock talked 'manufactured art.'
- [17] Pitt-Rivers shows how his attitudes towards 'savages' informs his theory. "And so in studying savages and early races whose mental development corresponds in some degree to that of children, we have to guard against this automorphism, as Mr. Spencer terms it; ... the tendency to estimate the capacity of others by our own, ..." M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.142. Thompson mentions that he is indebted to Herbert Spencer for this lecture.
- [18] Although charged with atheism by opponents he countered using the idea of evolutionary progress. In a speech to the Archeological Society, Salisbury, 1887, he said that if we were created in the image of God "... it is obvious that the very best of us have greatly degenerated. But if on the other hand we recognise that we have sprung from inferior beings, then, there is no cause for anxiety on account of the occasional backsliding observable amongst men, and we are encouraged to hope that with the help of Providence, notwithstanding frequent relapses towards the primitive condition of our remote forefathers we may continue to improve in the long run as we have done hitherto." (See M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.120.)

CHAPTER 5.

Introduction	285.
Art and Manufacture	292.
Museums	306.
The British Museum and the National Gallery - Beginnings	310.
Parliamentary Moves	314.
Curiosity, Education and the Role of the Museum	327.
Collecting, Class and Trips Abroad	338.
Travellers and Access to Collections	343.
Natural History	352.
Collecting	356.
Damage and Legislation	367.
Access, Rights of Entry, Behaviour and Sunday Opening	371.
Sundays and Evenings	378.
Access to Private Collections	390.
Art History, Experts and Purchasing Policies	397.
The Arranging of Exhibits and Ideas of Progress at the National Gallery and British Museum	408.
Labelling and Catalogues	417.
Modern Developments: A Brief Survey	423.
Some Further Modern Developments	431.
The Good Museum Guide and Admission Charges	440.
Notes	450.

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the development of museum policy and ideas of progress and civilisation. It looks at the ideas of the functionaries and the part these played in the moulding of the arrangement of exhibits 1830-1860. This includes discussion of admission policies, collectors and collections, the growth of expertise, foreign acquisitions, funding, ethnography, architecture, the behaviour of visitors, idea about labelling, arrangement and art history. The main emphasis is on the 19th century, but I briefly survey subsequent developments in the light of the foregoing.

It is also important to see the development of museums against political and economic concerns, ideas and certain moralities which as Corrigan says are the paths by which "...a particular class understand the requirements of an effective organisation of production which sustains their way of life." [Corrigan, P., 1980a p. xx] Moral is defined as "something as general as *social* and Corrigan, Ramsey and Sayer, relate ideas of class and morality through Marx's theory of production. [Corrigan, Ch.1 *The State As a Relation of Production* p.2]. According to them, Capitalist production entails a set of social relations:

Production means making things, Things are not made in abstraction, they are fashioned and fabricated in definite concrete ways and those ways entail particular relations among the people who are engaged in that production or *in making it possible for others to engage directly*, [my italics]. These relations and one aspect of them, ideas about the relationships, are produced along with the products themselves.

[Corrigan, 1980a p.2]

They quote Marx, who sees the human relations produced as corresponding to 'the specific form of the state,' and as revealers of 'the hidden basis of the entire social structure.' It is in this way that Corrigan talks of "the moral ethos of political economy..." which is the "dominant" theory and also of *another* morality. This other morality, however, encompasses a *social* economy with ideas of collectivity and egalitarianism.

We have noted (in Chapter 3) that more and more the middle classes aspired to aristocratic standards, with country pursuits, residences and tastes. Elias noticed that ideas about what is civilised tend to come from 'above' - 'downwards' and Corrigan makes the point that in the 19th Century and "well into the 20th" those in power have affiliations with the values of the landed aristocracy.[Corrigan, 1980a xx] For Corrigan, the genesis of the state in England helps us to grasp the idea of "a general moral ethos." He cites a passage from *Reversing the Trend* by Keith Joseph,[Rose Books 1976], in which Joseph says that for four centuries the rich man's aim has been "to get away from a background of trade - later industry - in which he has made his wealth and power." [pp.60-61] Along with such things as classical education for middle class children, the collecting of art treasures and visiting exhibition, Steegman [1950] describes how after the Napoleonic wars, "newly enriched men" began collecting "while not ceasing to be businessmen." [pp.51-53] There were men like Peel and Angerstein, Sheepshanks and Veron. John Sheepshanks was a Yorkshire woollen manufacturer and Robert Vernon made his fortune as a horse dealer with army contracts during the wars. Both collected contemporary art and both left their pictures to the nation. Some "collectors" acquired paintings through an agent, content to receive

status symbols to add to their environments and were generally uninterested in art.

How does all this relate to the seemingly near-obsession that some politicians had for relating the arts to manufacture or for the promotion of museums? In the same way as one can discuss a morality of education or religious belief, one can see a desire to "*civilise*" as well as "to be civilised." Steegman sees a recurrent theme, present also in Mechanics' Institutes, where improvement was joined to ideas of art and morals. Morality was to be changed by art. This conviction "was an article of faith held by philanthropists, reformers, educationalists and social workers ..." [Steegman, 1950, p.143] Sometimes the morality of collectivity is used to promote ideas of political economy. This is often seen in reforming or "improving" literature. In 1832, there was a review of a new edition of Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* (still in print after over 50 years) in *The Penny Magazine* in the section called 'The Library' which recommended books for the readers' own bookshelf. Extolling the virtues of commercial freedom which is "the grand diffuser of civilisation", it says the progress which comes when "Everyman, down even to the humblest labourer" is striving to improve himself and his family, will benefit all society and the country. Personal improvement is national improvement, so that "the nation which is raised by its wealth to this pitch of civilisation, will be sure to beat its less happily circumstanced rivals." [23.6.32 No. 14, p.119] The reviewer calls for public recreations (also parks by subscription) saying:

All elegant enjoyments are widely diffused, made cheap by the universal taste which exists for them ... The most costly books which are printed may be purchased by the small contributions of many readers and placed in a common library ... a portion of the public wealth may be devoted to form a collection of the great masters of the

pictorial art, which may be thrown open to all other collections, galleries of statuary, museums of antiquities, or of specimens of natural history, zoological gardens, in which are brought together the living natives of every clime of the earth, may be established on the same principle at the public charge, or even created by private associations,²

What goes unquestioned, is the direction and substance of improvement and progress, so that although it is a need often remarked upon (in such publications as *The Penny Magazine, Parliament etc.*) it becomes the *morality of the state which:*

generates best when it is unremarked; when a particular way of carrying out some social activity becomes seen as the only way of so doing; when a particular schooling is inflated to become education itself.
[Corrigan, P. 1980, a XXIV. See also Elias' notion of self-regulating ways of behaving.]

When Corrigan says that State regulation "entails an extensive moral classification which operates culturally rather than through coercive means"[xxiv], he refers to the control that becomes internalised into self-control and an expectation of ways of behaving. What we see in the 19th Century are attempts to filter certain moral classifications down to 'the labouring classes' through such institutions as museums, Schools of Design and libraries while at the same time, maintaining and furthering the dominant morality. National Pride and prestige were included as well as the ultimate economic goals.

There are some differences in approach of those 'above' from those 'below' as we shall see when we examine the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures, but these mainly focus on ways of funding. It is also apparant that the middle classes have more of an ideal image of the working classes than they have of themselves. Experts, including art

connoisseurs, artists, politicians and manufacturers directly influence policy decisions. Corrigan describes the importance of:

The long established 'gentleman' ideal (service, quietism, a certain amateurism) [which] through the increasing (i) employment within the state (at first in a subaltern role) and (ii) general involvement with State regulation, *of professionals and experts* [cf. Abrams, 1968] That is to say, a particular way of legitimating the State's activities (and thereby naturalising a certain range of actions) increasingly draws upon the evidence and skills of experts from within technical, scientific and medical areas and latterly 'from the wider areas of social policy.' Such expertise was originally used to justify one course among several others; ...
[Corrigan, 1980 a xxiv-xxx]

When Select Committees discussed arts and manufacture and such topics as the organisation of museums, only a few witnesses were working class and they were mainly from trades which were considered superior to most. The majority of such witnesses believed in government action on museums but they held in common with the other witnesses (artists, connoisseurs, politicians and manufacturers) a favourable mood towards self-improvement. Indeed, the working class witnesses are just as likely to be critical of other workers as are middle class witnesses. As with the temperance movement some issues proved meeting points for the working and middle classes. With regard to the Sunday opening of museums debate, working class opinion was split. Some were for the Sunday opening, including Lovett and various select committee witnesses who were for self-improvement. The concurrence of this view with that of middle class reform is made more apparent at points where they actually meet, like select committees. Here we see that much of the topic of debate is the working class and yet they are under-represented on both sides of the table. The questions are framed by the perceptions of the politician and Ewart, for example, is apt to ask very leading questions that in

themselves almost provide the answer and often create space merely for an expected "yes" or "no". One artisan (as we shall see later) questioned for a select committee on evening opening, however, managed to bring in something of his views on Sunday opening although it was made clear that that was not the issue at stake. The views on Sunday opening also split the middle classes into (crudely) Sabbatarians versus reformers. The Sabbatarians appealed for working class support. Thus when the Post Office planned to introduce the movement of mail through London on a Sunday in 1847 the Evangelical Alliance in Scotland created an essay competition especially for the working classes who were to write on the "temporal" advantages of Sunday observance. In 1848 Ashley [Hammonds, 1939, p. 220] persuaded Prince Albert "who was anxious to show his interest in social questions" to give £50 for prizes. [J. Wigley, 1980, pp. 64-5] Other competitions followed. Arguments used to appeal to the working classes included the exploitation of labour who worked hard enough as it was. Some essays were against Sunday amusements because of the tendency to make people work to provide services for them. Politically, the essays tended to be conservative (one essayist condemned strikes because they meant working class people pawned their Sunday clothes). By 1850 every M.P. was sent a copy of the "lavishly bound volume of the Albertian Prize Essays, and ... Ashley referred to them as authentic expressions of working class opinion." [Wigley, '80p66] Yet this did not, of course, alter the relative position of one class to another.

Paul Richards recognises the importance of the use of "expertise" in the nineteenth century in terms of its general *and* specific effects.

Official 'knowledge' asserted its superiority over working class 'knowledge' as being 'scientific' as opposed to the 'nonsense' expounded by popular representatives. Yet the ideological content of

State expertise and its use to legitimise the interests of the bourgeoisie is clear from the case of the handloom weavers. It is also true that the application of official expertise could realise an improvement in working class conditions ... The Factory Acts are the obvious example, albeit as attempts to contain class struggle *and* to promote a healthy and productive working class as against the effects of capitalist competition. The genuine humanitarianism of some policy matters should not be denied. But nineteenth century State servants cannot be regarded as neutral social scientists better equipped than anyone else to administer to *social need*, however well-intentioned and intelligent some of them may have been.
[Corrigan, P, 1980a pp. 77-8]

Can this analysis be applied to museums? We have noted the view of Harvie et al., 1970, that social relations are governed by relations of production and that Jones and Novak say that the State that protects and embodies these relations, in doing so, also reproduces these relations under capitalism. In chapter Three, we saw how the struggle of middle class women for greater economic independence was eventually permitted although the majority of women were still economically dependent on men. (In a general sense, in that most men were employers and in the lack of educational and professional opportunity. This dependence is still with us, reflected, not least, in social security laws.) The social relations of inequality in the nineteenth century, enshrined in such concepts as progress, civilisation, taste, commercial freedom and improvement, were also present in the "cultural" field of museums and art and in the debates about government funding, the organisation of museums etc.

Paul Richards talks about the need to close the gap between society and state that is "postulated by academic orthodoxy." [Corrigan, P. 1980a p. 52] and that "A useful way to do this is to study parliament. Here we are inside the state with the men 'in charge' ... *and* with representatives of 'society' itself ..." This is the battleground in policy-making and where

Richards mentions select committees, for example, into the Health of Towns and the way they embody the policy of liberal philanthropists, below, we will examine museum policy through some of the committees, various Acts and debates. Stephen Yeo [P. Corrigan, 1980a Ch 5, 'State, Anti-State', p. 112] notes how various arrangements are made in every society to provide basic needs and that these involve "forms of association"; pubs, factories, music-halls, schools etc. As with museums the "varieties of product and social relations involved in meeting such needs cry out, What kind? For whom? How much? How patterned? By whom? In what relations with each other? How can they be read?"

Art and Manufacture

The Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures sat in 1835 (and again in 1836). The radical M.P. William Ewart had moved for the Select Committee saying that "arts, like commerce, ought to be essentially free" and that he believed "the best mode of infusing into the people of this country a reverence and taste for the Fine Arts ... was the opening of all the means by which a knowledge of the Fine Arts was to be acquired." [W.A. Munford, 1960, pp. 78-9] Moreover said Ewart, this would improve our design which compared unfavourably with that of designers abroad. He displayed a twin approach; education (through museums and schools of design) and economic competitiveness. These were the two ideas that informed most of the questions Ewart asked of Select Committee witnesses. As Munford says, "The evidence taken was planned to conform to the pattern of Ewart's major reforming speeches..." [p. 80] Ewart, who became

famous for his work on museums and libraries (as well as against capital punishment) came from a merchant family of Liverpool. (Indeed, "The firm of Ewart, Myers and Company handled too many products of British factories and mills for Ewart to be unaware of contemporary standards." [Munford, 1960, p.77]) His father's brothers were mainly professional men and of his own brothers, two went into the family business and one into the church. Two of his sisters did not go into business themselves but married into it. William went to Eton and Oxford and then did a Grand Tour during which he visited many art galleries, palaces and churches and met the "society" abroad, including aristocrats. Previous to 1832 he had had to buy a seat in Parliament but he supported the Reform Bill, of which he said, "On this question, as on every other, I confess myself the supporter of sound and rational improvement. On this single term, improvement, as on a great principle, I base all my opinions and views." [Munford, 1960, p.51] After some years he moved from London to a country residence in a Tory area although by then he was a Liberal.

The other members of the 1835 Committee were a mixture of Whig, Tory and Radical including Bowring, Bernal, Grote, Hume, Peel, Brotherton, Roebuck, Wyse and, later, Buckingham. Eventually it had forty-nine members. The major themes of the evidence included comparisons between British and foreign manufactures (also the issue of copy right for designs), taste, the necessity of museums and design education and the funding for the last two. The outcome was a continuation of the Committee the following year, the creation of Government Schools of Design and as Steegman says, "The elevation of public taste was nearly an obsession during the 1840's. The optimistic side of the early Victorian character believed that such a thing was possible; the materialistic side saw

commercial advantage in it."[Steegman, 1971, p.130] Steegman also says that from that point onwards opinion and events "may be seen as bending steadily though not without obstruction, towards the triumph of the Great Exhibition."[p. 142]

The first witness in 1835 was Dr. Gustav Fredrick Waagen, Director for twenty years of the Royal Gallery in Berlin. Berlin, he said, had an institute for design with four colleges and a collection of models;

representing the newest discoveries in Europe and particularly in England, there is also a very complete collection of the finest ornaments and designs of the Greek and Roman and middle ages in plaster of Paris ... the pupils are also instructed in drawing, modelling, in mathematics and perspective; and one chooses his own department of manufacture; they are also taught the founding and casting of metalworks and other manufacturing operations.
[Parliamentary Papers, 1835, p. 379]

(PP)

These schools were free and run by the Government and also included natural history, physiology, chemistry and "perpetual communication" between the students and principal manufacturers. Waagen said the aim was to unite taste and beauty with "practicability and durability"^{PP}[1835, p. 381]. The use and availability of casts and the opening of museums as ways of improving taste is mentioned time and time again by Ewart and most agree with him. A Mr. Joseph Clinton Robertson who ran the *Mechanic's Magazine* (established then for eleven years) was convinced mechanics showed interest in studies from which they knew they could profit, like design and drawing. All in favour of exhibitions, Mr. Robertson pointed to the "superiority of the educated and travelled classes in all that regards matters of taste."^{PP}[1835, p. 498]

The Chief Engraver at the Royal Mint, William Wyon Esq., originally from Birmingham, believed that taste and manufacture would improve with

free access to museums and plaster casts. All towns should have galleries but industrial centres like Sheffield, Manchester and Birmingham, should have museums of manufacture relevant to their industries.[1835, p. 505] He was asked:

Ewart - "Do you consider that the early elementary education of the people in art would increase the means of applying art to the manufactures of the country?"

Wyon - "I think there cannot be the slightest doubt,"
(PP1835, p, 508)

Wyon contended that raising the standards of taste would also create a demand for "art manufactures." Manufacturers would benefit and "the morals of the country would be greatly improved by creating a new taste."

Mr. Charles Harriott Smith, sculptor of architectural ornaments then working on capitals and other ornaments for the exterior of the National Gallery, Trafalgar Sq., also approved of museums for the working classes. Public exhibitions, he said, were the best method of "diffusing taste" and "I have found often among workmen a desire of going to these exhibitions" and to see works of art.(PP1835 p422) These, he continued, are the working classes who want to improve themselves, read more, who go to coffee houses rather than pubs and who will not associate with those who do. He also, at Ewart's prompting, mentions the penny magazines[see Ch 3];

Ewart - "Do you think the cheap penny publications have had any effect on their habits, and have been in any way instrumental in improving their minds?"

C.H.S. - "I do think so; most of my men take them in,"
(PP1835 p423)

Ewart then asked if these workmen with "improved habits", "deserve encouragement by instruction, and opening public places of resort where

they will be made familiar with works of art?" Smith replied; "Decidedly; I have heard them express a wish to that effect." The accessibility of museums he said in reply to another of Ewart's questions, was also desirable as "the best means of serving the industrial classes is to increase their means of serving themselves."

George Rennie giving evidence a week later also returned to the theme of self-help. He agreed with the other witnesses that "The standard" or "dissemination" of taste would improve if museums were accessible. "I think", he said, "The standard of public taste would very soon be raised by opening a museum in every town," and further suggested that Mechanic's Institutes should connect their activities with the local museums.[PP1835 p449] Exhibitions were good, also, because they "always stimulate invention." As other witnesses pointed out, the standard of manufacture would be found to improve, leading to greater discrimination by the consumer and a general raising of the quality of manufactures goods. Rennie believed, therefore, that museums would be a self-help system for the working classes and artists *and* for everyone else.⁴

Rennie did not, however, see this voluntary system as a back-up to (or alongside) a national education system. A central system of education would stifle individualism.⁵ More than one witness suggested that museums could be places of instruction. George Faggo, historical painter, believed in the necessity of schools of design and discussed Mechanics' Institutes as possibilities for producing them. However, "Another way might also be easily accomplished by placing museums under the direction of men capable of communicating instruction." His ideas on funding the instruction reveal two sides of the education debate based on the idea of self-help; education for career prospects should be paid for by the

student but the general education for the good of society should be free.

He said;

good taste is so essential to the interests of the community that museums should be provided at the national expense; but practical skill being an advantage of a more individual nature, ought rather to be paid for moderately by the individual,
(PP1835, p, 427)

John Martin, a coach painter, referred to the superiority of French China painting and draughtsmanship and suggested that the British Museum could be "a school with masters."^{PP}1835, p.442] Waagen too believed that museums had a part to play in the application of arts manufacture. Along with Fine Arts institutes they could provide "the opportunity of seeing the most beautiful objects of art in the particular branch which they follow; by having collections of the most beautiful models of furniture and of different objects of manufacture."^{PP}1835 p 383] Another witness, Mr. Robert Butt, a superintendent of the bronze and porcelain department of a Regent St. firm, believed in schools of design with museum connections. Exhibits would benefit manufacturing artists, yet "such a museum ought to be open to the public under certain limitations, to prevent their interfering with the studies of the scholars." (PP 1835 p418)

Later, Charles Cockerell giving evidence as "architect of the Bank of England" (he was also a Commissioner in 1851) compared English and French design. He said "Having resided a good deal abroad, I have been piqued as an Englishman at seeing the great superiority of foreigners in that respect." [p. 480] In France, moreover, leisure time is spent in;

the palaces and gardens of the kings, where they have beautiful works before their eyes, in architecture, sculpture and painting; a paternal and enlightened government long ago (nearly 300 years) provided these elegant recreations for the people, instead of passing their holiday

as our artisans do, in the pot-house ... I have been struck with the
degrading comparison,
(PP 1835, p. 4821

Thus for Cockerell the free opening of galleries would provide "refined recreation" and gratify the urges of "curiosity or study". Artisans, he felt, needed the tuition of men from the "higher schools" but would be confused if taught "higher art". We must not, he said, echoing the sentiment of John Ruskin (as a Select Committee witness in 1860), "interfere with their proper callings and right division of labour, in which excellence already requires all their ability." [PP 1835p 4821] Basically, according to Cockerell, the work of the artisan was laborious and therefore their knowledge "must be always very limited compared to those who have an original genius for it, and have been brought up in the highest schools, and with the best opportunities of instruction. " To attempt to teach them the "higher principles" would be futile.

As far as schools of design went, they were generally seen as an important part of competing with other European countries. When we look forward to 1851, when Cockerell was on the building committee for the Great Exhibition, his comments are particularly significant.⁶ This idea that French taste was superior persisted and Boase notes the English "sense of artistic inferiority". He draws our attention to an "old quip" which said: "The French have goût, and we have gout." [Boase, 1959, p.263] There were also similar comparisons made between English and French museums. Charles Toplis, "Vice President of London's Mechanics' Institutions" and director of the Museum of Natural Manufacture, Leicester Square, told the Committee how the Louvre was used for copying and when Ewart asked if he thought English people had equal opportunity "with most

civilised nations for developing their taste in art?" Toplis replied "I think not." (PP 1835 p490)

The comparisons of English with European means of allowing people to see art presupposed two main things: the "elevating" nature of art and foreign travel. Neither of these were new. [See T. Fawcett. 1974] There were some societies encouraging the arts in the 18th Century but there was a great upsurge in the first twenty years of the next century. [Fawcett, 1974, p.1] The recognition of the importance of art to commerce also had early precedents. In some industrial centres, Birmingham, for example, there had been two or three schools, (in 1760), for artisans to learn basic design and any exhibitions were discussed in terms of the benefit to industry. The Industrial Revolution was a long process and these early examples show industry recognising the need for educating artisans. Economic developments were changing the way the role of art was viewed, and also, later, the ability of art to purify and refine was linked to urban working class depravities. This optimism sometimes called naive, is understandable in terms of the current belief in progress. Fawcett describes how certain supporters of provincial institutions went further that a faith in the moral influence of art, "they believed they were labouring for a future golden age; analogies between Georgian England and Renaissance Italy (or even Periclean Athens) were not unknown. William Roscoe, for one, drew the parallel between Liverpool and Florence ..." (Fawcett, 1974, p6)

We have already mentioned, [in Chapter 4], that there were numerous exhibitions throughout Great Britain before the 1830's. There was the R.A. founded in 1768 whose annual exhibitions were 'open' and membership of which conferred high social status. One writer claims that Liverpool held

the first provincial art exhibition in 1774 and it was organised by a local art society.[G. Chandler, 1957, p.448. See also Fawcett] Fawcett, however, says it had "come to nothing." He mentions the Norwich Society of Artists (founded in 1803), which began to hold annual exhibitions in 1805 and the proliferation of such societies from then on. In 1835, Architects Philip and Robert Barnes, were witnesses and both were part of the Norwich Society of Arts. They said the exhibitions continued until 1833 when lack of people and patronage brought them to a stop. In 1830, an academy of art had been created which had managed to get £100 from Norwich Corporation to buy casts "with a view to have it as an open and more public establishment.[PP1835p474] There were only six pupils, however, and these had to pay £4 a year with instruction being given by artists. Philip Barnes said that although the academy had little to do with manufacture, that they hoped to extend it in that way. Theirs was the only gallery in Norwich, but they had a great number of "casts from the antique." It was not open to the general public but if one wished to see it, one could apply to the secretary. They wanted to open it, but would do so when they could afford a superintendent and thus the "lower orders" would be much improved.

J.A. Picton described the development of the Liverpool Royal Institution, founded in 1814. Fourteen years later, it began to offer a prize of 28 guineas for the best three works, painting, drawing and sculpture done by artists living in Liverpool, "which may be exhibited at the approaching Exhibition at the Royal Institution, in proof of the desire felt by the Corporation to encourage the productions of talent and genius in the town of Liverpool." They were judged by the Council, and three men chosen by the former. In 1829, 100 guineas were offered and two

sets of prizes were awarded, the higher of which went to Academicians and a prize for architectural design was introduced. Writing in the 1880's, Picton says that the Corporation's money, then seen as munificent, would now be "viewed with contempt." [Picton, J.A. 1886, pp.313-314] The Society of Artists petitioned the Liverpool Council in 1833 for money to open the Exhibition Rooms and the Council waived rent, but when the lease ran out a few years later, it was not renewed and the Exhibition was abandoned. Both Norwich and Liverpool societies (the aim of the latter was "to promote the Fine Arts"), ran into difficulties soon after political reform, but it was not long after that the idea of the usefulness of art to industry began to be voiced louder and louder. It soon became a matter of economic policy, social policy and national pride.

Appendix 1 of the 1835 Select Committee's Report consists of a letter from Mr. S. Kene "on the subject of the Exposition of Articles of Manufacture in France," 25.11.29, to the Hon. Lord Meadowbank. It describes 'The Exposition of National Industry' in Paris, which, Kene says, excited "a general interest among all classes of society in that country in the advancement of industry, and in the progress of improvement, as well as in ascertaining the actual state of the productions ... and of mechanical ingenuity." [1835; p.513] It proved very popular as a "subject of national exultation and created a rivalry which "stimulates to increasing efforts." In a passage which could have been written during the Great Exhibition, Kene says:

The public display of the most successful performances only, in the different branches of manufacturing industry practised in the country, places their skill and success under so favourable comparison with that of neighbouring nations, whose exportation productions ... naturally become the subjects of comparative judgement,

Britain, he said, should follow this example of "stimulating exertion by honorary awards."

The French exhibitions had begun in 1814 with three between that year and 1827, thereafter fixed for every four years under "the sanction and personal inspection of His Majesty."^{PP}[1835, p.513] The Monarch (who gave out the prizes), was also part of the "direct management because of his ability to call upon the support of local authorities to promote the Exhibition. The organisation was a board of twenty, "two men of rank ... and people conversant with sciences and manufacture. Individual manufactures also liked the idea of advertising their products. Kene described further, the arrangement of the Exhibition: there were different sections, for example, silk stuffs, wood, woollen yarn, woollen cloth, carpets, firearms and so forth. Coming as it does in the 1835 report, this letter shows that the build up to the 1851 (albeit international, although made up of national comparisons) was gradual and it relates the ideas of art, commerce and museums to the Great Exhibition. There were, as Fawcett says, early examples of such concerns, but it is from the mid-thirties onwards when M.P.'s from middle class backgrounds, sometimes manufacturing and from industrial areas, begin to consolidate their position in government and have profound effects on social policy.

Ultimately, the 1835 and 1836 reports called for a more organised system of design education, even though there was general approval of the Mechanics' Institutes. Perhaps there was also implicit criticism of them too. Toplis tried to give the impression that the London Mechanics' Institute provided courses for self-improvement and also industry. He said the design taught consisted of geometrical and mechanical drawing,

drawing to scale, drawing of ornament, the human figure and landscape.^{PP}[1835, p.486] Their museum had no art gallery, but it did have models, minerals and "apparatus." In some ways agreeing with Rennie that high art was not relevant to the worker and perhaps wishing to give an impression of practicality, Toplis replied to Ewart's inquiry whether there was a gallery "as would amount to an exhibition of works of art ...?" with an emphatic "Certainly not ..."^{PP}[1835, p.487] There was no dispute that his Institute provided, as he said, "cheap and relevant" education, but it was in many ways relevant to the majority of students who were clerks. These came to the premises in Chancery Lane to the most popular evening classes which were English Grammar and French; (second most popular was Natural History and Literary Composition, third was Geography, but the fourth was Chemistry, in the mutual instruction classes.)

The discussions, in the Select Committee of 1835 and 1836, about the creation of the Government Schools of Design, threw up questions about the role of the Government and public responsibility. Industrial education was seen to be better abroad. Ewart, in 1835, asked James Morrison, (also a member of the Committee) whether the Government had done enough to "educate the eyes of the people" by "freely opening galleries" and how Britain compared with abroad in this respect. Morrison replied that abroad, even small states had schools of design "yet in this country, at the head of the manufactures of the world, and where it would be of the most importance, we have nothing of the kind."^{PP}[1835, p.394] Waagen had described the Berlin Institut^{PP}[1835, p.379]; M. Felix Bogaerts, Professor of History, Antwerp, told the Committee that in his country, artisans had free access to academies when the professors are paid by the city or town and that the French were better educated than the British.^{PP}[1835,

p.455] Ewart pressed on to secure the 1836 Select Committee which had fifteen members, nine of whom were radicals. Again, there were accounts advocating museums and schools of design and a criticism of their lack in this country. The outcome was a Government School of Design set up in Somerset House, (in the rooms vacated by the R.A. in its move to the National Gallery Building. Indeed, Ewart and the artist Haydon, among others, had objected to this because the R.A. was an independent body which had no right to space in a building provided by public money.) The Council of the School had Poulett Thompson from the Board of Trade as its President and included manufacturers and painters Eastlake, (later Keeper and then Director of the National Gallery), Callcott, the sculptor Chantry and the architect Cockerell. William Dyce, the painter, was also sent to investigate state schools in France, Bavaria and Prussia. His conclusion was that they should not be seen as the "infallible nostrum" many wanted them to be.

The School of Design itself was divided into Fine Art and Industrial Design sections and in 1841 Government grants helped establish branch schools.⁷ Complaints about British Design, however, went on (and continued *after* the Great Exhibition. See John Steegman, 1971, p.142) In 1860, an English goldsmith complained that foreign designers commanded higher wages in Britain and that these people had told him that "abroad, at Vienna and so on, they are taught in Government schools by the best masters and ... this instruction is given to them at a time when they can receive it."(PP 1860a p116)

With the Schools of Design, there was a step further towards a state education (although business was expected to contribute. See Bell, 1963, p.102). Most of the witnesses of 1835 were also in favour of a middle

course of subscription *and* Government funds. Mr. Eld, the Mayor of Coventry, believed that Government funding should be used to encourage voluntary efforts,[pp.413-414] The Barnes of Norwich compared Bruges with their home town. Bruges had a population of 20,000 and an academy of art which taught 6-7,000 at evening classes, whereas Norwich, with its 70,000 inhabitants taught just six students at their academy. They believed, therefore, that Government assistance was necessary, as was a centrally controlled system.^{PP}[1835, p.477] James Morrison thought Government money should provide museums ^{PP}[1835, p.449] as did George Faggo who thought individuals should pay for schools of design.^{PP}[1835, p.427] Cockerell believed in Government spending on private institutions which fostered the fine arts and in the giving of prizes for works applicable to manufacture. This latter idea would give the " ... Legislature ... the desired effect at a much cheaper rate ... for the general improvement or application of arts to manufactures."^{PP}[1835, p.584] (The idea of incentive and excellence is still used today, see below, K. Hudson's argument for admission charges to museums.) Mr. John Henning who did the relief over the gate to Hyde Park and the frieze of the Athenaeum, was himself, self-educated and very much against government "interference." Voluntary subscription could provide and he thought that "... society ought not to trouble the Government with things which it can so easily do itself ...". (PP 1835 p438)

Interestingly enough, the debates in Parliament surrounding Ewart's attempts to bring in laws that would enable local governments to levy rates for museums and libraries, were dominated by arguments over the funding. The Schools of Design used central Government's funds, but the idea of levying rates locally, was unpopular with M.P.'s ever mindful of

being answerable to the ratepayers. This is why there were stringent rules about local authorities adopting such Acts and the rate to be levied for museums was very low. In the next section, we look at views of museums reflected in their origins and in their architecture.

Museums

The origin of museums has a mention, if not a chapter, devoted to it in almost any book one might care to read about museums.[These include J. Mordaunt Crook, 1972, pp.19ff; K. Hudson, 1975; D. Ripley, 1970, Chapter 1; A. Wittlin, 1949, Chapter 1.] Essentially, the word 'museum' comes from a Greek word, meaning the Muses' realm and "It was a place where man's mind could attain a mood of aloofness above everyday affairs." It also mixed "Elements of a sacred temple and of an educational institution.[Wittlin, p.1] In Greece, according to Wittlin, a museum was a place of research "regarded as a service to the Muses" and included statues of intellectuals, offerings to the Gods, scientific instruments and natural history specimens. She also points to the "encyclopaedic" character of the Greek museum which is an idea established in many museums of today.[p.2-3] The term "museum" was also used in 16th Century Italy to apply to a mixed collection and the word "galleria" referred to a long hall for paintings and statues.⁴ Other terms used to describe collections later, included "Cabinet" and "Chamber", (French - "Chambre". German - "Kammer") or "Closet". Wittlin notes the intimacy conveyed by these words as by another which was used - "penetralia".[p.4-5] "Repository" was

another word, which is similar to the "guardaroba" of Renaissance collectors. As Wittlin says:

The characteristics implied in those terms may potentially exist in the present Museum. The following qualities, both spiritual and material, seem to be inherent in them; interest in learning and encyclopaedic approach to inquiry, inspirational values, privacy and secrecy; rarity; boastful costliness; features connected with storage

(1949, p6)

Even if we look at 20th Century ideas about museums we find images of museums as being quiet, quasi-religious places of contemplation. Bourdieu and Darbel's research showed that most people likened a museum to a church; 66% of manual workers thought so, 45% of skilled and white collar workers and 30.5% of professional and upper managerial - (Bourdieu and Darbel also Berger, 1979, p.24) whilst a significant proportion of all classes thought a museum was like a church, a higher proportion of working class people did. This highlights museums as places demanding reverence which will be heightened if there are feelings that one is excluded or does not belong. Posy Simmonds also had a clever cartoon in *The Guardian* which showed the trendy college lecturer, Weber, taking his children for their Sunday visit to the National Art Gallery. The children see the father as a preacher and the religious experience is concluded by the obligation to put one's pennies in the collection. This feeling of the museum as a place 'apart' from the everyday, can apply just as much to modern art galleries. A New York taxi driver once told a television reporter that he often went to the Museum of Modern Art, [MOMA], to contemplate the abstract art in the quiet atmosphere and to meditate away from the chaos outside in the streets. (All that seems to be missing is the incense. Grâna has also mentioned this quality of museums, 1971, p.95)

Malraux criticises museums as collections of objects completely out of context, saying that altar paintings and crucifixes are taken from their real environment.[A. Malraux, 1952, p.65]

Museums, however, appear to have created their own atmosphere or environment which is "apart" like a church and in which, now, we expect there to be certain objects. It is interesting to see how the language of church architecture extended to the building of the 1851 Exhibition which had a nave and transepts even though the Crystal Palace itself was seen as the height of modernity. Seling quotes an 18th Century source to show how the church idea was carried on over time. "Picture halls ... ought to be temples, where in subdued and silent humility ... we may admire the great artists ... Works of art in their essence fit as little in the common flow of life as the thought of God."[H. Seling, 1967, p.114. From Wackenroder's *Herzenserglessungen* Berlin, 1797, pp.79-80] This has been changed and manipulated according to how museums see their role and their public.

Duncan and Wallach note how museums come into the same architectural category as temples and churches and that they share fundamental characteristics with ceremonial monuments.[C. Duncan and A. Wallach, 1980, pp.448-9] Dillian Ripley also believes that the architecture of a museum, invoking past symbols, temples, pantheons, palaces and tombs, signals its importance. (D. Ripley, 1970, p.17) According to Duncan and Wallach, this is not "only a revival of architectural styles, but also a modern adaptation of those ancient practices."[p.448-9] Today's museums are comparable to "Roman displays of war trophies. The loot that was paraded through Rome ..." The Louvre also exhibited captured enemies' arms and works of art. (Some of Napoleon's acquisitions from war with Spain

were later possessed by Wellington and brought to Apsley House where today we can see a statue of Napoleon and various Spanish paintings including Velasquez.) Duncan and Wallach also believe that museum collections of "primitive" art and artifacts "function as permanent triumphal processions testifying to Western supremacy and world domination." [p.449] and we shall discuss this later. Generally speaking, the grand architectural styles employed in 19th Century Britain, were Greek, for large public buildings, Jacobean for domestic building and Gothic for churches. [Steegman, 1971, p. 80] Although Duncan and Wallach are describing the architectural influence of The Louvre on U.S. Museum building it could also be said of Britain that "The architects who designed the new museums used a variety of architectural styles to invoke the theme of civilisation. Greek, Roman and Italian Renaissance proved almost equally serviceable." [p. 464] Mordaunt-Crook (1972) describes, in a fair amount of detail, the plans for building the new British Museum around the old site of Montagu House. [See p. 90ff] Robert Smirke began designing it in 1820 (his pupil was Cockerell who he saw in 1835) but execution kept being delayed mainly for financial reasons. His Greek design began to be put up in the 1840's when there was more of a demand for ornament. One design for the pediment was called 'The Progress of Civilisation' and was by Westmacott (who we also saw as a witness in 1835). Westmacott described it to Sir Henry Ellis, head of the British Museum, as a tableau depicting Man emerging from a nude, savage state under the influence of religion and becoming a hunter/tiller. There was to be the "patriarchal simplicity" of the worship of a god followed by worship of heavenly bodies leading to the Egyptian study of astronomy. Civilisation was to be seen to progress from the East to the West where

mathematics, drama, poetry and music were in a succession to end with natural history. (Mordaunt-Crook, 1972 p126-7) Duncan and Wallach maintain that the use of such architecture and its invocation of Graeco-Roman civilisation as "an abstract and universal value" link it to America's pursuit of imperialist conquests, (eg., the building of the Metropolitan Museum). Mordaunt-Crook says that between 1850-1914 there were 295 museums founded and that between 1845-1914 ninety of these were wholly new. The classical style was used in such museums as the National Gallery, The Tate, Ashmolean and Fitzwilliam, Cambridge. There were also numerous provincial examples."

Before we discuss the proposals for public museums throughout England let us first look at the origins of the British Museum and the National Gallery. The national and provincial museums are linked, not least by the attempts of reformers such as Ewart to open open up the former to "The public" and those efforts occurred at roughly the same time as parliamentary moves to provide the latter. We turn, firstly, to the two big London institutions.

The British Museum and The National Gallery - Beginnings.

The history of museums from private collections to public museums is included in all the books on museums mentioned so far, (Wittlin's is the most comprehensive. See also Altick, 1978, Chapter 1). We take up the story in the mid-18th century with the formation of the British Museum. On March 13, 1753, the Manchester Mercury reported that the king was not to buy Hans Sloane's collection and that the "House of Commons will soon

take that affair in to their consideration." Royal assent for "purchasing Sir Hans Sloane's mufeum, and the Harleian Manuscripts" came on June 7th., 1753.[See *The Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1753, p. 588]. Hans Sloane, (1660-1753) had a collection including 50,000 books and manuscripts, 23,000 coins which he classified and some of the birds and insects were arranged in 'life scenes'[see Altick, 1978, p.19] This was to cost £20,000 and that of Harley, £10,000, to be raised by a lottery which was also to provide money for salaries and housing the items. By the time the museum opened in Montagu House, Bloomsbury (1759) other purchases had been added including the Cottonean collection.'"

The Act of 1753 created 41 trustees, 6 from the families of Sloane, Cotton and Harley, 20 ex-officio trustees (including the Lord Chancellor, Archbishop of Canterbury and President of the Royal Society and 15 others to be elected by the first 26.[see Mordaunt-Crook, 1972, pp.51ff.] Later additions were the President of the Royal Academy and that of the Society of Antiquities and this powerful group representing Church, State and intellectual society lasted until 1963.)

At first access was limited to three hours a day and as a treasure house it had its armed sentry (only removed in 1963). By 1774, May-August, the hours had extended to 9 a.m. - 3 p.m. Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday and between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m. Monday and Friday. September to April it was 9 a.m. - 3 p.m. Monday to Friday. (See Report from The Select Committee respecting the mode of admission of visitors. Journals of the House of Commons Vol. 34, p. 738, 1772-4. Also Mordaunt-Crook, 1972, p.53) It was closed on Saturday and Sunday, on Christmas Day and for a week after, and at Easter for one week. It was also shut at Whitsun for a week as well as Good Friday. Gaining access could be a long

difficult process and then one generally had only two hours inside. There were also criticisms; one visitor in 1786 said "nothing is in order"[Wittlin, 1949, p.114] and in 1785 William Hutton, a visitor from Birmingham, felt he was rushed through by the guide and said; "It grieved me to think how much I lost for want of a little information." [Mordaunt-Crook, 1972, p.65] Originally there were three departments: Manuscripts, Medals and Coins and Natural and Artificial Productions (from which 11 departments grew including Greek and Roman, Ethnography and Egyptian and others at S. Kensington). In 1805 tickets were abolished and in 1810 people were allowed to enter at will with groups of 15 shown round by a guide with Friday reserved for artists. As yet, the British Museum had no regular funds and few staff on low wages but the collection was augmented by special Parliamentary grants (eg., The Elgin Marbles in 1816 for £35,000) and as a result of wars and travel.

Both the British Museum and National Gallery feature in many of the later topics discussed but before going further we will briefly outline the emergence of the latter. In 1824 the House of Commons voted £60,000 to buy the collection of 38 paintings from Angerstein.¹¹ The collection continued to grow by gift and purchase. One gift was a Rubens from Sir George Beaumont of whom Boase says he "had been largely responsible for a National Gallery being founded" as he said he would give his collection if parliament bought Angerstein's pictures and a building for their housing.¹²

The trustees of the museum were, at first, constituted into a committee of 6 (later 8) people who were intermediaries between the keeper (William Seguer) and the Treasury.[See Boase 1959, p.204] They were to give the keeper his orders and the keeper's job was to be in

charge of the collection, its preservation and admission to the gallery, to be present "occasionally" in the gallery and "value and negotiate" with regard to purchasing paintings.[Parliamentary Papers, 1952-3, 3&4] They did not, however, meet for the first three and a half years but there were occasional visits.¹³ Gradually, meetings became more frequent and in 1840 a rule was brought in to meet the first Monday of the month during Parliamentary Sessions and this was generally kept to. The Select Committee on the National Gallery 1852-3 reported that the Committee of Trustees were generally more active than before and described them as "immediate Directors of the Gallery." The meetings had no rules about order and there was no quorum. Decisions could be made by a very few, for example, Eastlake and one other trustee went and decided which paintings were to be chosen from the Vernon collection in 1847.¹⁴ When Seguier died in 1843 and Charles Eastlake became keeper he received a Treasury instruction that he was "under the direction of the Trustees." [Robertson 1978, p.79] Now there were 16 trustees, 9 of whom were also part of the Fine Arts Commission and "nearly everyone of whom had met the new keeper." It was difficult, however, to get many of them to attend meetings in 1843 which was partly due to political duties, for, "Peel, as Prime Minister, had other responsibilities; Aberdeen, Graham and Ripon were preoccupied at the Foreign Office, the Home Office and the Board of Trade. November, December, and January passed without a meeting."

By 1852 there were 17 men as trustees but as the 1853 Select Committee recommended that ex-officio members be dropped and the others not to be replaced as they died. In 1860 the average attendance at meetings was 5. (pp 1860 Vol XL p. 121) In 1865 there were 5 trustees. This prompted Lord Overstone, a more active trustee than

most, to recommend that there be more members with a greater definition of their duties.[Robertson 1978, p.288] The trend was towards tighter organisation, with the trustees as an advisory body but the Director as ultimate decision maker. Over the years too, the National Gallery faced criticism over its purchases, opening hours and the hanging of paintings. In 1838 it moved from Angerstein's house in Pall Mall to its present site in Trafalgar Square. Although praised for its central position the design was criticised and the interior was described as a "motley and ill-assorted collection, shabby lining of the walls - strips of board licked over with paint of a dull green hue - the place has more the look of an auction sale-room than a public gallery."[From *The Spectator*, April 14th, 1838, cited in Robertson, 1978, p.79] As we shall see later, developments which would lead to greater stress on the importance of the arrangement of pictures, were already afoot. In the next part we see how the philosophy of 1835 makes an impact on parliamentary efforts to create public museums.

Parliamentary Moves

It can be no coincidence that very soon after the Select Committees on Arts and Manufacture that the first bill was introduced to include provision to give greater opportunity for "the people" to have access to museums. In 1837 Mr. Tulk, Mr. Brotherton and Mr. Buckingham prepared a bill called "Public Walks and Institutions, A Bill for the Establishment of Public Walks and Playgrounds, and of Public Institutions, Libraries and Museums for the purpose of promoting the Health, Morals and Instruction

and Enjoyment of the People."(Parliamentary Papers, 1837, p. 61) The details of the proposals are interesting; fifty ratepayers could ask the Mayor to hold a public meeting or give him three days notice of their intention to hold one, should he refuse: the vote was to be carried by a two-thirds majority and a 'Committee of Recreation' of 21 to be elected by ratepayers to execute and manage the facilities. Rank of Governor for Life could be conferred on those donating £100 and Annual Governor if they gave £10 per annum. These would enjoy all the privileges of elected members of the committee.(PP1837p3) The Committee could borrow money for land and building (amounting to no more than ten shillings per inhabitant) and repay it from a fund "to be open for the investment of money"[p. 4] with shares of £100 and interest of 5%. The interest was to be paid off by a levy on the rental of places paying rates, (not more than 3d in the pound for half a year or 6d in the pound for the whole year), and to be collected as other taxes. The goal was "That at the end of Twenty Years the whole of the Public Walks and Public Institutions connected with the same, may be free of an incumbrance or charge on the funds of the town." The Committee was also to have responsibility for making rules for "The preservation of order and decorum, and fix such moderate rates of payment for admission to the several parts of the Public Walks and Public Institutions..." These charges were to be kept to a minimum "compatible with the comfort of visitors themselves, and the preservation of the whole Establishment in a state of order and tranquility throughout." The aim was to have a reform which was essentially to be a public yet independent venture. The title of the bill has much in common with the sanitary reports - "The Health and Morals ..." It is a measure which also presupposes an urban population and indeed

is proposed to deal with them. The term 'the people' is not the all-embracing term it implies. The ratepayers of the town are also to have the power to initiate the committee, control it and buy themselves into it.

When Ewart's bill, brought in seven years later "To enable Town Councils to establish Museums of Art in Corporate Towns"[Parliamentary Papers, 1845, pp. 437-441], "it did not lack support." [Munford'60p117] It carried on the concerns of the Arts and Manufacture Select Committee and had a number of points in common with the bill of 1837. Its aim was for PP 1845 "the instruction and amusements of the inhabitants." [p. 437] Further, the councils of boroughs could fix admission prices: "provided that such rates of payment shall not exceed the sum of One Penny for every person admitted" and could also make rules for "the maintenance of order and decorum." The debate, when the bill was first introduced, (6.3.45 - see H. 3rd Ser. 78, 27th Feb - 2nd April 1845, pp. 381ff. Also a report in *The Times*, 7.3.45, p. 5), had Ewart praising the MP for Taunton (Wyse) for "The merit of the measure."^{H,} [p. 381] ¹⁸⁴⁵ He pointed to the fact that they had both sat on the Committee recommending the creation of the Schools of Design which had "first of all recommend the establishment of a central school in the metropolis ...[and] of schools in the various manufacturing towns in connection with the central school." Ewart wished the central school to begin "making masters" to give "elementary education in art..." but he trusted that they were making advances towards that more perfect system which existed in foreign countries."^{H,} [p. 382] ¹⁸⁴⁵ As the debate progresses we shall see the impact the Select Committee had on various considerations connected with museum policy.

Again, we see this measure is essentially an urban one influenced by the Committee which also wished to show "the people" the development of art. Ewart said;

Another recommendation of the Committee was, that exhibitions or galleries of art should be established in the various manufacturing and other large towns of the country. It was not intended that those exhibitions should be limited to the temporary purposes of mere ephemeral exhibitions. The Committee were anxious that those museums should contain specimens of antique art, of mediaeval art, and modern art. That recommendation had not been carried into effect, and it was to remedy this omission that the present bill was proposed.

Both Wyse and Ewart emphasised that the bill was to enable or empower, not to force towns to have a museum. They were to be funded by a small borough rate and once built private donations of art and money would follow. The idea of public funding, levying rates for education, was still anathema to many and worried others who believed in some public contribution. Wyse argued that voluntary support had tendencies to "contingencies" which made for uncertainty although he believed "works of art, valuable books or specimens of natural history" would be donated if there was a building. The bill, Ewart said;

... was merely a power which enabled town-councils to act - which invested them with authority - in case the inhabitants were not disposed, by voluntary contributions to adopt the necessary means for the erection of museums and other similar institutions for the advancement of knowledge and the promotion of art.(H, 1845, p384)

Wyse said he was also assured of the support of "scientific and mechanic's institutions."

Ewart returned to the theme of plastercasts that had been evident during the 1835 Select Committee. Railways, he said, allowed a diffusion of art never enjoyed before as casts could be sent around and;

... it would be the fault of the Government if there was a single manufacturing or large town in the country deficient of a museum of such a character as might give a sound taste in art to the population of that town, and thus enable them to apply the skill they would obtain in the arts to manufactures.[H 1845, p383)

The efficacy of plaster casts to educate public taste is something taken for granted. Casts to be seen and copied appeared to be the answer for large towns outside the metropolis but no-one in the arts and manufactures debate questioned the use of the antique as a model, rather, it was advocated. John Henning told the 1835 Committee that although he saw voluntary subscription museums as important as providers of models of all kinds (eg., mechanical) that the copying of antique statuary was an important part of self-improvement. In 1811, he had wanted to copy the Elgin Marbles but had had to provide Lord Elgin with a recommendation from an R.A. member.[PP1835 p 436ff] Ewart, in his speech in 1845, also mentions antique statuary saying that until Rome had an abundance of statues "They never became aware of the value of the arts; and it was the same with the people of this country." [H. 1845, p. 383] Sir W. James, the MP for Hull, who spoke for the bill, had visited the mechanics' institution in his constituency and had been surprised at the taste the members had shown for works of art.[pp. 384-5] Sir J. Hanmer had given them "a large collection of classical casts and their value was fully appreciated." [p. 385] Later in the debate, Mr. Labouchere said that the opportunity to see models was important for those living in manufacturing towns "for without them all attempts at imparting a correct taste must fail." [p. 393] He cites the case of the sculptor, Chantry, "that great artist who, it was well known, had sprung from the lower ranks of society, frequently complained of the inconvenience which he had found in

early life from the want of an opportunity of educating his eye by the inspection of superior models. The youth of Britain need "the great works of the ancient masters constantly before them."

Ewart thought museums would "wipe away the stain" on the artistic reputation of the country which he said was a stigma indeed. Mark Philips (described by Lady Simon as "the progressive member of Parliament for Manchester"^{H 1845}[p.304]) She describes his active role in the provision of parks in Manchester) later in the debate, ^{H 1845}[p.385-6], said he was for everything that promoted the taste of the operative classes especially as they were the ones who carried out the designs for industry. A taste for the fine arts was "of vast importance" so that museums should even be open on Sunday when the working classes could go because as things stood, the British Museum was of no use at all. Mr. Hume, for Montrose, wanted the bill to embrace public walks and playgrounds saying that the Government should encourage such things for labouring people. This was important as "the result of similar experiments in London was that the people had deserted the public houses."^{H 1845}[p.387] This was also taken up by Lord John Manners who wanted to see the day every large town and agricultural areas gave "the people the opportunities of manly and healthy amusement and recreation."^{H 1845}[p.390] The effects of this on the behaviour of "the people" proved they were grateful for opportunities of visiting public exhibitions. Indeed, said Manners, the more galleries there were in large towns, "the more would be done to work out the true civilisation of the country." Museums were to civilise "the people" by fostering better taste leading to better workmanship, British goods competing on the market and the better behaviour of the working classes. As one M.P. put it, museums were to "improve the social system, and to

render the artisan and the labourer sober and industrious, cheerful and intellectual." [Mr. Gore, H 1845 p.391] He said that exhibitions such as a geological museum, had made the people's conduct noble in the past and such advantages would improve morals, purify the spirit and "extend the basis on which rested the foundation of peace, security and national prosperity." This was also echoed by Mr. Hutt who supported the bill and said their most precious object should be "to withdraw the labourer from gross and sensual pursuits and give him some relish for more refined intellectual enjoyment." ^{H 1845} [p.392] Mr. Brotherton too, said it was better to pay for museums than to raise large sums in taxation for the prevention and punishment of crime. [H 1845, p391]

Whilst all the M.P.'s agreed on the aims of the bill, there was a plea for caution from Prime Minister Peel which expressed the fears of those against the measures. He was concerned "as to how they confer too extensive powers of taxation upon town councils, for the purposes of establishing these museums." ^{H 1845} [p.388] Too great a call on local taxation, continued Peel, would only make rate payers hostile to the good goals of the bill. *Moreover, as he would have to go softly with the demands for the improvement of ventilation and "the salubrity of dwellings" so there was a need for the same as regards museums.* ^{H 1845} [p.388] This, of course, would affect the funding and he advised the raising of the money through subscription for the building of a museum (because those who had prospered from manufacture would remember their obligations to industry and contribute) and to ask for local money to run it because "the same experiment had been tried successfully in respect to the endowment of ^{H 1845} churches." [p.389] Lord John Manners also pointed out that as town councils had yearly elections "he did not think that they would be likely to take

very unpopular courses."^{H 1845}[p.390] Mr. Brotherton, (who had helped to prepare the 1837 bill) was, however, opposed to Peel's suggestion and proposed that a ½d in the pound be levied to pay for the *foundation* of the museum but that it be *run* by voluntary efforts after."^{H 1845}[p.391] =

By the time the 1845 bill had become an Act (July 21st, 1845), the title had changed from - "...To enable Town Councils to establish.." to "An Act for encouraging the establishment of Museums in Large Towns ..."

Although the 1844 Act established the possibility of rate-aided museums it was not something that really became established until much later in the 19th Century.[J. Wilkinson, 1980, p.131] There were over 40 museums in Britain before 1845,[Alma Wittlin, 1949, p.136, puts the figure at 59 museums before 1850], but, as Julie Wilkenson (1980) points out, more than 30 belonged to universities, literary societies and so forth.[p.131]

Private subscription and generosity, could, as Brotherton pointed out, be unstable. Lady Simon describes how it was patchy and unequal throughout Britain; Manchester, for example, had less of its total parks (19%), by private gift than Birmingham, (29%), and Sheffield (48%).[Lady Simon. 1938, p.311 n.1] (She also shows that,perhaps the "infallible nostrum" was not appreciated by everyone. A noble duke is said to have responded to a request to lend some of his art collection to the Art Treasures Exhibition in 1857 with "what in the world do you want with art in Manchester? Why can't you stick to your cotton spinning?"^{Lady Simon, 1938}[p.277] Later, in Manchester in 1880, there is an example of the private art gallery of the Royal Manchester Institution, which housed the School of Design from 1853-1881, transferring to a corporation gallery and it was granted £2,000 p.a. to buy pictures.

Five years after the 1845 Act, another bill was introduced by Ewart for "enabling Town Councils to establish Public Libraries and Museums." [British ~~Seas~~ ^{PP} Papers, 1850, pp.351, 355, 361). It was designed, as Munford says, [1960, p.132], to consolidate the 1845 Act. Now there were to be no admission charges of 1d, or population limit and councils were to pay staff, provide furniture and fuel and appoint a Committee. The rate was to be set at a maximum of ¼d in the pound and the aim was to improve the instruction and recreation of the people. The parliamentary debate, accompanying the second reading, (see H 109, 26th Feb.-26th Mar. 1850, pp.838ff) on March 13th went over much of the ground covered in 1845. Ewart declared the bill was about refining the people's taste and the "cultivation of their minds." [p.839] ^{PP 1850} Mr. Labouchere believed libraries were even more important than museums in this respect, ^{PP1850} [p.844], that libraries promoted education and that M.P.'s should not fear that they would simply provide entertainment with novels or "be mere receptacles for newspapers." Again, a major worry which influenced the main direction of the debate was that of taxation. Mr. Spooner objected to paying for places "that may be converted into normal schools of ^{PP 1850} agitation" [p.847] and that once introduced, this taxation would be liable to increases. Mr. Slaney, replying, used the argument about the savings libraries would cause as "they lessened the incentives to a dissolute life." and they stopped visits to pubs and lowered crime which cost Britain more money.

Mr. Goulburn, however, was against the bill because he said it would merely be a newsroom for the well-to-do who had the leisure to read. He was also worried about the question of precisely *who* "was to have the power of selection?" and any censorship this may entail. ^{PP 1850} [p.841-2] A

voluntary system, he felt, would avoid these problems and unlike taxation, would be paid for by those reaping the benefits. Mr. Wyld saw it differently - "in the light of an economic question."^{PP 1850}[p.849-850] Money would be saved by a reduced crime rate, he persisted. He pointed to an experiment, "namely that of taking twelve women from the educated and twelve from the ordinary class, and setting them to work in the same department, when it was found that the educated twelve produced thirty per cent more work than the others." Libraries, therefore, would increase productivity and leisure and work, are here^{connected}as two sides of the same coin. Although Wyld does not elaborate about the "experiment" what he is doing is equating education and usefulness and identifying it with the middle classes, (that is, unless by 'educated' he refers to the working classes, although it is doubtful.) Civilizing those of the lower orders could, therefore, his reasoning suggests, have real economic impact. Ewart, however, also appealed to "nobler" motives. He had said that half the holdings of the British Museum consisted of donations and, "Nor could he conceive any more honourable object of ambition than that of an individual who wished to see his name inscribed in some department of a public library, and handed down to future generations as a benefactor of his kind"^{PP 1850}[p.850] He also thought that in this "sordid age" when dividends and percentages absorbed men's minds he would be gratified if "an opportunity could be given of inviting them to see the more enobling pursuits of literature." In his call for a Select Committee (which was appointed) he said "still more should he gratified if the inquiry tended, however slightly or remotely, to elevate the literary, ^{PP 1850}moral and religious character of the people." [p.850]

During the debate on the second reading of the 1850 bill, Ewart proposed (as Peel had for museums, in 1845) that the money levied should be used for the building and that the books, newspapers and so on were to be donated. Sir R.H. Inglis, who opposed the bill, criticised this as "a tax for the purpose of constructing empty rooms" in which there could be lectures "which might give rise to unhealthy agitation."^{PP 1850}[p.848] Colonel Sibhorpe (noted for his opposition to the Great Exhibition) was also against the bill because it increased taxation, food was needed not books and because "he did not like reading at all and he hated it when at Oxford."^{H 1850}[p.839] He would have been more kindly disposed towards the bill, he said, if "the Hon. Gentleman (Ewart) ... had tried to encourage national industry by keeping out the foreigner." Some M.P.'s objected to the bill because it ignored agricultural workers even though the taxation involved would include landed property which may penalise labourers wages.[Mr. Buck p.840. Lord John Manners, p.844. Mr. W. Miles, p.845-6] Colonel Chatterton opposed the bill on similar grounds because:

Though professedly for the amusement and instruction of the people, its real object now turns out to be actual, permanent and forced taxation ... I object to it ... for it cannot be imagined that a peasant, fatigued after his daily toil, could be so impressed with the love of literature, or the study of the antique as to set off, even under the influence of a bright summer evening, to walk six or seven miles to improve his mind and then walk back to ponder over and digest what he had seen and heard ... no person can be more anxious than I am for every fair opportunity being given to the working classes to gain useful knowledge, still I never can consent to this method of procuring it by taxing the many for the supposed advantage of the few, [At the 3rd Reading, H, Vol. 113, July 19 - Aug. 15, 1850, p.480-1]

Like Sibhorpe, Chatterton did not wish the bill to include Ireland, but Mr. G.A. Hamilton, for the bill, said that Colonel Chatterton had taken care Irish people could be taught to read but not provide libraries which

was why "they were driven to read inflammatory publications." (The motion to exclude Ireland was defeated by 43 votes.)

During the second reading, Brotherton expressed surprise at the opposition to what was a "permissive" bill, but there were real fears that it would kill voluntary efforts. Mr. Roundell Palmer said that he "intended to take his stand against the substitution of the compulsory H 1850 for the voluntary principle in all matters of education ..." [pp.847-848] and Mr. Harvard, against Government interference, said that the bill would H 1850 check the enterprise of "mechanics' institutions and the like." [p.849] Brotherton argued, however, that the bill would *support* private endeavour. In Salford, for example, the museum had been created by the town council H 1850 and along with the library, it had been stocked by private gift. [pp.840-1] Mr. Spooner did not agree, for if the books could be donated, then why not the building too?

The fear of runaway taxation led some supporters to voice caution. Voting for the second reading, Mr. Hume said he would only continue to support the bill if there was "the adoption of the principle similar to H 1850 that which was applicable to the lighting of towns." [p.843] He wanted a provision for a two thirds majority vote of ratepayers. The bill passed its second reading by seventeen votes. [Ayes, 118. Noes, 101] Before the third reading, however, Ewart announced some changes; a population limit of 10,000 and adoption of the Act to be subject to the calling of a ratepayers' meeting. Three days notice had to be given for such a meeting and a two thirds majority necessary. [H. 1850, April 10th, p.154] If the meeting refused to adopt the Act there could be no vote again within one year. (This was re-amended to two years, on 24/7/'50) So, although presented as an "enabling" Act, fears of taxation and "public" facilities

led to greater difficulties in its introduction being a part of the Act. One M.P. had even wanted the ratepayers meeting to include one half of their number.^{H 1850}[Mr. Stanford, p.162-3] Mr. Brotherton, however, pointed out that "that would tend to defeat the object of the Bill", as they could not expect a town of 70-80,000 to hold such a gathering - in Manchester there was no room big enough. Thus, some M.P.'s spoke on their agreement with the Act's aims, but wanted stipulations that would make it unworkable. Royal Assent was given on 14th August, 1850 and there were a few places that adopted the Act soon after.(Norwich 1850, Winchester 1851, Bolton, Oxford and Ipswich 1852.)[Munford, 1960, p.133]

Another Act, in 1855, "laid down the main framework in which Public Libraries were to operate until 1919." [Munford, 1960, p.140] The rate limit was raised to 1d in the pound, and books, maps and specimens of art and science could be provided from it. The population limit came down to 5,000 with two or more neighbouring parishes allowed to combine. Also rate aided technical education could be introduced into Schools of Design, but, according to Munford, this was not generally taken up. Indeed, although Parliament still discussed the issues in terms of public order "since fewer than twenty Local Authorities had seen fit to establish Public Libraries, the threat to the public house was not yet serious." [p.141]

All the concerns of social policy, agitation, crime, economic rationality, played a part in the debates about museums. Libraries and museums were linked together in these issues, as both were seen as facilities for voluntary education (despite the arguments about whether the funding should be voluntary or not). They shared the same Acts and up to this day are often in the same building or group of buildings. For

Ewart, museums were also proof that real changes were occurring for the better and it was also a question of national pride. Announcing two petitions from Birmingham for public libraries:

He said, for several years they had introduced into this country various enlargements of our formerly exclusive system, in reference to the arts, after the example of foreign countries. We had opened a National Gallery, Hampton Court, and other public edifices; we had established Schools of Design, but there was one instrument of public improvement common to foreign countries which did not exist, in this he meant the institution of public libraries freely accessible to the people.

[H, March 15th 1849]

In the following section, we discuss the various views of the role of the museum; museums as satisfiers of curiosity, educational institutions (or both) and museums as a civilising force.

Curiosity, Education and the Role of the Museum

We have seen how Duncan and Wallach interpret the display of won trophies. There are still forms of 'parading of goods' that confer status on the owners. At wedding receptions, presents are sometimes displayed and the gifts from the Royal Wedding were put on show. There was also a game show on television which made contestants memorise a stream of goods passing on a conveyer belt. Samuel Bamford also describes an example, during the rush-bearing feast, when a cart was decorated, "a kind of concentration of the riches and the pomp of the party was displayed in the arrangements and setting forth of 'the sheet' ... on it were arranged ... silver watches, trays, spoons, sugar tongs, tea pots, snuffers, or other fitting articles of ornament or value, and the more numerous and

precious articles were, the greater was the deference which the party which displayed them expected from the wondering crowd." [Dunkley, ed, 1893, p.130ff] Some writers discuss later forms of museums in terms of religious display. Altick and Ripley call the interest in seeing, curiosity, which is a human impulse. Altick cites the Pardoner and his relics and says "the medieval church was the common man's first museum." Where there were "tangible objects to be gazed upon in awe." [Altick, 1978, p.5] Later, when fairs created overt commercialism and protest and desanctified relics, it "in no way diminished the people's innate hunger for marvels." The desire to see and know, or, as Altick says, for curiosity and wonder, was embedded in the satisfaction of seeing *for oneself*. Adding colour to peoples' lives, this also catered for the illiterate, so that he says there is a direct line from the Bartholomew Fair to South Kensington.

It is interesting to note that those advocating the 'human impulse' theory of curiosity, generally apply it to the lower classes and pursuits such as side shows. Yet, curiosity becomes intellectual inquiry when related to painting and sculpture. The Grand Tour was seen as a necessary part of a gentleman's education. One traveller wrote how he visited a church at the Convent of Lichtenstal to see two "curiosities." Two skeletons of saints were covered in jewels, the fingers and toes had rings and the ribs lines of precious stones. Out from this "misplaced decoration" the saints "grinned with ghastliness." His tone is critical, yet he obviously examined the items very carefully. If curiosity is therefore a "human impulse" it is not confined to one class. [J.S. Buckingham, no date, p.434]

Donald Horne, in his book on *The Social meaning of sightseeing in Europe*, discusses the role of a museum and other "rituals" in terms of group solidarity[1984, p.2], a view also expressed by Wittlin.[1949, p.199] Nowadays, he says, we have a public culture which did not exist before industrial society:

and the rituals in which the people themselves may participate, to show that they belong - the sporting ceremonies, the fairs, the expositions, the ceremonies of nation or class and the voting rituals ... now give magic to power. From soap opera to museum exhibit, these are the re-affirmations of what life is supposed to be about, modern manifestations of what began as stampings and chantings around tribal fires and paintings on cave walls. They are an important part of what make us human,

(Horne, 1984, p2)

Although Horne later gives examples of the changes monuments can undergo depending on the political group dominant at various moments in history, the above statement is unhelpful. "Cave" culture cannot be so *directly* linked to museum exhibits without discussing economic and political circumstances that give rise to them at particular times. It is meaningless and conservative ultimately for what one is saying is that that is the way it has been, is and will be because human nature is 'that way'. Elias avoided this by relating changes to power groups and vice versa so that he linked cultural changes to political changes over time. The urge to know and experience, curiosity, can be described as human but the historical circumstances cannot be given a secondary significance. In 19th Century England the slow rise of Industrial capitalism gave rise to political ideas and policy of which the role of art and industry were a part. It simply does not help us to understand if there is too much emphasis on the "human nature" idea and indeed it helps us to ignore so much.

In 19th Century England, the role of the museum was generally seen as educative (and recreational) or as mere amusement. As we saw, there was great recognition of this in the 1830's. When Hans Sloane died in 1753, his Will stated a wish that his collection be useful by satisfying curiosity *and* improving knowledge. Yet it was not until the 19th Century that as the latter wish ascended in importance and influenced (to a greater extent) the arrangement of objects in museums. As we have seen, a visitor to the British Museum in 1786, complained that "nothing is in order" and a William Hutton from Birmingham, who had been the previous year, was disappointed to be rushed through in half an hour said "It grieved me to think how much I had lost for want of a little information." [Mordaunt-Crook, 1972, pp.62 and 65] In 1805, admission tickets were abolished, three years later an official synopsis produced, in 1810, people were allowed to enter at will (though the numbers were still restricted to parties of 15) and the trustees said the museum's purpose was the promotion of art and science, *not* amusement. In the mid-19th Century, however, James Silk Buckingham complained about the British Museum's lack of educational purpose, for though many pass through it "...satisfying their curiosity by gazing at the various objects as they pass, but coming away with very little addition to their knowledge ..."[p.12] The Academy of Painting was better, he thought, because it had a "fine gallery, on the plan of the Louvre at Paris ..." with a library which opened every day except Sunday and admitted "all persons of decent appearance and orderly behaviour" where they had free use of the books. There were also free lectures for the public. About the same time, in London, the painter Haydon, opened an exhibition of two of his new works (*Aristides and Nero*) in the Egyptian Hall. His advertisement declared he

had spent forty two years "simplifying the principle of art for the instruction of the People," but the failure to attract visitors was highlighted by the hordes going into the building to see Barnum's *Tom Thumb* in another room.¹⁶

The educational role of museums was emphasised in select committees and parliamentary debate.¹⁷ There is a very interesting example of 1832 in *The Penny Magazine* (which sees itself as part of the movement for voluntary education). It began a series of articles about the National Gallery and the British Museum. The first article, [No. 3, April 7th 1832, pp.13-14] discussed the propensity to mischief of the populace which they hastily qualified by the phrase - "perhaps we ought to say people, for it extends to the middle classes" in case we assume they mean the working classes who may be offended. Later, in the same article, however, they state "We will suppose ourselves addressing an artisan or tradesman, who can sometimes afford to take a holiday." [p.14] They quote from the *Quarterly Review* that it is good to have something that corrects the love of mischief, gives "innocent enjoyment", engenders "a taste for intellectual pleasures." It is also hoped that the articles will "point out many expensive pleasures of the very highest orders, which all those who reside in London have within their reach; "and also instruct their children. Concern that appeals to the "national heritage" may not stop damage to exhibits is expressed when they say that:

Having learnt to enjoy them, they will naturally feel a pride in the possession by the Nation, of many of the most valuable treasures of Art and Science; and they will hold that person a baby in mind - a spoiled, wilful, mischeivous baby - who dares to attempt the slightest injury to the public property, which had been collected together, at an immense expense, for the public advantage.

Indeed, the rest of the article tends only to belie the assertion that the collection at the British Museum belongs to the artisan. It believes that the artisan who visits a museum is a family man who forsakes the tap-room and the din of the skittleground, (although children under 8 years were not allowed in case they disturbed other visitors.) Do not be put off by the sentinels, it continues, and go up the large, closed gates and "knock boldly" for admission to see the "curiosities" is free. (Here it bemoans the too frequent charging of the people for "what they ought to see for nothing.") The porter will open the door and you will find yourself in a large courtyard with an old fashioned house occupying three sides. Up a flight of stairs is the main entrance:

Go on, Do not fear any surly looks or impertinent glances from any person in attendance. You are upon safe ground here. You are come to see your own property. You have as much right to see it ... as the highest in the land. There is no favour in showing it you. You assist in paying for the purchase, and the maintenance of it; and one of the very best effects that could result from that expense would be to set a proper value upon the enjoyments which such public property is capable of affording ... Your garb is homely, you think, as you see gaily dressed persons going in and out. No matter, you and your wife, and your children, are clean, if not smart,

Spoken from a position of superiority and addressed to the "moral" artisan, it is at once condescending, yet strong, in its urging for *him* to partake of the cultural delights of a higher class. The article leads him through the "lofty room" and up the fine staircase and over the formality of one member of a group filling his name, address and number of persons with him, in a book. (Said to count 70,000 or so visitors each year.) The British Museum, says *The Penny Magazine*, will advance people in knowledge and virtue so that:

What reasonable man would abandon himself to low gratifications - to drinking or to gambling - when he may - whenever he pleases, and as

often as he pleases, at no cost but that of his time, enjoy the sight of some of the most curious and valuable things in the world, with as much ease as a prince walking about in his own private gallery,

This admission is a privilege carrying responsibility, and (reminiscent of Erasmus' advice to young boys on behaviour - see Elias Vol. 1, p.59) thus "it will be necessary to observe a few simple rules." The first rule was *"Touch Nothing"*. The second, *"Do not talk loud"* is a rule the magazine apologises for and it says:

Do not call loudly from one end of a long gallery to the other, or you will distract the attention of those who derive great enjoyment from an undisturbed contemplation of the wonders in these rooms, You will excuse this hint,

The apology is obviously included in case the reader takes offence at the imputation that he may behave in this way. The third rule was "Be not Obtrusive" and urges the artisan not to trouble other visitors and artists with queries but rather to ask the attendant:

You will see many things in the Museum that you do not understand, It will be well to make a memorandum of these, to be inquired into at your leisure, and in these inquiries we shall endeavour to assist you from time to time, But do not trouble other visitors with your questions, and, above all, do not trouble the young artists, some of who you will see making drawings for their improvement, Their time is precious to them; and it is a real inconvenience ... to have their attention disturbed by an over-curious person peeping at what they are doing ... You must not expect to understand what you see all at once; you must go again and again if you wish to obtain real knowledge, beyond the gratification of passing curiosity,

What comes across very strongly in the article is that the museum is a place for the privileged; that working class behaviour is not refined enough and it is just as worried about social behaviour as damage to exhibits. (They are loud and obtrusive); that working class people are ignorant of worthwhile knowledge as represented by the British Museum. It

tells the artisan to be more civilised and just as the Museum is shown as a force representing this, so is the *Penny Magazine*. Here, it is a clear example of middle class propaganda - the conscious effort to inculcate ideas which is part of a whole process that includes knowing what a museum is, or is like and to a large extent gives an image that has survived. As if aware that working class people may well be put off, not only by the atmosphere and social discomforts, but by the exhibits themselves, the article urges, the artisan to persevere. Just how relevant were antique statues (or casts)? The arts and manufactures experts believed they were very relevant to the artisan, (but in 1851 the machinery proved the greatest attraction to the urban working class.)

As I have agreed, the educational role of museums is emphasised in the 19th Century. Places like Hampton Court, Morton's music hall picture gallery, (see Chapter 2), and the pleasure grounds on Pitt-Rivers' estate, pave the way for the twinning of the ideas of entertainment and education. This grows with the development of commercial entertainment. The greater emphasis of one or the other (education or entertainment) can alter with circumstances. In the First World War, there were appeals in Parliament to keep the London galleries open for educational purposes. The Coalition Government, however, justified their closure by saying that most people used them as mere places of amusement and not education, thus their closure was no great loss. The National Gallery and British Museum were shut, the objects stored elsewhere and military personnel installed in their place. Although the Government said it would save money, they were criticised by one M.P. who said that the closing would save £50-60,000. This was a drop in the ocean compared to the cost of the war - £100,000 an hour.[H. 5th Series, Vol. LXX, 1916. 25/1/16 and

26/1/16] Later, when the 1919 Libraries Bill was being debated, one M.P. said the 1d rate was too small "to meet the growing educational demands of the public ..."

The role of museums is not a dead topic, (for example, see K. Hudson *passim*). One recent report in 1973, noted the wider range of activities undertaken in museums, (for example tourist information and "general cultural activities" such as music) and the need to link up with adult education and schools.[Standing Committee Report (SCR) 1973. Provincial Museums and Galleries DES. 4.14] Museums should be voluntary education and also part of the school curriculum through visits and loans.[15.23ff. See also J. Wilkenson, 1980, on school visits to the Gladstone Pottery Museum, p.244ff.] Dillon Ripley, too, sees museums as "the principle unrecognised arms of education ... the exhibits are there. They can be taken or left alone." [Ripley, 1970, p.85] For him, also, curiosity is good if it is the first step into a museum. Wittlin, writing in 1949, also has much to say on the educational role of the museum, especially of the future. She predicted that museums would play a greater part in the leisure industry and the weekend car outing. She also advocates certain developments which illustrate her ideas on the role of the museum. The first type, she calls the Research Museum, to be used by students, which would present objects, including paintings, in a filed, encyclopaedic system. Another type would be the museum or centre to train people in "Basic Facts" and present a format to appeal to all classes. She says, "the students of this centre may differ in vocation, interests and income, and yet they will be more closely united than a similar group would have been a hundred or more years ago." [Wittlin, 1949, p.197] The similarity is based on the fact they all vote, are subject to large administrative

organisations and that the bomb is a great social leveller for "all together they would dwindle to a spot of destruction under the impact of a single explosive bomb." Basic Facts are to include a general history of "Man" to show a progressive linear development. "Man's Progress in Control Over His Environment" would include the "tools of primitive man - made and used thousands of years ago in Europe, or at present among some native tribes of Australia or Africa - and implements or models ... and pictures illustrating Progress up to machine power, air transport" Wittlin 1949
 ...[p.198] The comparative materials advocated, remind one that colonial ideas have not died. (Recently, the front page of the *Observer* 12/8/85, carried a picture and story of a foreign visit by the Pope, showing him embracing a Black child. The caption referred to the child as a native and not in the sense of, for example, "native Irishman", where the word is an adjective, not a noun.) According to Wittlin, history should be treated factually and these facts should lead to a study of sociology or psychology. Written not long after the Second World War, the book advocated a new start "on the scale of a European reconstruction of education" and to avoid conflict by understanding each others' problems.[p.200] This in itself belies her belief that a totally factual account of history is possible. Her beliefs are informing the form and content of her suggestions. The third museum would be a Museum For the General Public aiming to impart "information in the form of an easily conceivable synthesis" by the use of current affairs and general topic, for example, an earthquake in the news could be part of a geological exhibition. The cheerful promise is one of value-free exhibitions with an emphasis on *human* achievements yet the comparisons generally refer to the progress of the West and the primitiveness of the East and Africa.

One cannot doubt the sincerity in her pleas for the moral role of the museum for "humanity" which, she says, would be "a sin against democracy" to ignore.[p.222] Dillon Ripley, too, ascribes the Museum with the power to "find the seeds of a part of our salvation." [Ripley, 1970, p.37] We can assume that he refers to crime in New York when he says:

It is ... of the first importance that those who possess the intelligence, the influence, and the power, who from the experience of the past are impressed with the *tendencies as to the future*, should endeavour to provide all the means possible to avert evils similar to those with which this city had been afflicted ...
(Ripley, 1970, p61)

Museums must, he says later, militate against materialism (for example, the possession of goods) and self-centredness, for, "of what use are any of the proposed panaceas for the preservation of evolved civilization or the maintenance of culture, if the majority of living people *simply* don't care? If the education industry does not create people who are interested in the world about them ... then education is a failure." [p.101] Museums, therefore, have a moral purpose, but Ripley has not seen beyond the morality of Western progress.

The DES Report of 1973 [5.14], stated that museums' overall aims should work towards enhancing "the quality of life". Most of those proclaiming the educational role of the museum would agree. The middle class reformers would have agreement with people like Lovett that museums were "innocent diversions" [Lovett, 1920, p.59], and some, that Sunday opening of museums helped men to remain temperate. The former emphasised its use to the success of industry without relating it clearly to work practices, and Lovett, although more aware of them, rejected the morality of communism:

The idea of all the powers of machinery, of all the arts and inventions of men being applied for the benefit of all in common, to the lightening of their toil and the increase of their comforts, is one of the most captivating to those who accept the idea without investigation. The prospect of having spacious halls, gardens, libraries and museums at their command, of having light alternate labour in field or factory ...

Travellers in the 19th Century brought back to England descriptions of museums abroad which were used, (for example, in Select Committees), to compare them with English museums and this was done on their educational value amongst other things, (including hours of opening). We shall see in the following section how important travellers and collectors were to museums. Like the museum legislation of 1845 onwards, they also have links with industry and industrial competition. Ideas about civilisation and progress are also amply demonstrated.

Collecting, Class and Trips Abroad.

It is obvious, but true, that travel abroad was indispensable to collectors and collections (and it was generally undertaken by aristocratic and middle class people or agents who bought art for them). There are examples of working class travel abroad, (not including emigration) and some of these were collectors. European travel (including Greece) had a profound effect on what was brought back to England and on ideas about art and progress. The acquisitions of art objects from abroad tell a story of those who toured, collected, purchased, fought for and were concerned with the preservation of works considered important. The

last interest also often involved a whole set of attitudes towards "the foreigner".

The fact that more and more people were travelling abroad and bringing back information and comparisons of other countries with England, had many repercussions. Industrial capitalists wanted to know about their competitors and the writings of travellers and parliamentary papers show that this extends to information about foreign collections and museums. Eastlake's purchases for the National Gallery were "the results of annual trips abroad,"[Boase, 1959, p.222] and these affected the arrangements of paintings based on ideas of civilisation and progress encouraged by foreign travel by those who bought their own perceptions of progress to other countries. Travel also gave weight to the growing status of the "expert" - the intellectuals, collectors, politicians, foreign and military diplomats and museum functionaries who could often boast that they were acquainted with "most of the galleries in Europe." [Layard PP 1860b, p380)

An 18th Century comparison with other museums abroad differs from later ones. In the report from the select committee respecting the mode of Admission of Visitors, [*Journals of the House of Commons* 1772-1774, Vol. 34, p.734], Dr. Maty of the British Museum complained that the work of arranging the collections was constantly interrupted by "the coming of the Companies". Those who later proposed greater access to the public would have compared English museums unfavourably with, for example, the French. Dr. Maty, however, said the British Museum allowed more access than the French, for in Paris they had four months holiday a year and opened only two hours each on two days a week. Here, there was only thirty days holiday and he believed "almost all Foreign Museums have no

public Day ... " By 1835, however, George Faggo, (historical painter), is telling the Select Committee on Arts and Manufacture that in France the exhibitions, libraries and museums show a 'liberality' in advance of Britain and this is fostering good taste among the people.^{PP}[1835, p.427] .

James Morrison told the same Committee that "one cannot pass through a town without being struck with the regard and respect they entertain for art and the great love they have for it."[p.397] When asked if a strong feeling for art would be generated by museums and galleries being available to all classes, he replied that "... it is already generated to a large extent in this country among the upper classes, and we owe much to those gentlemen who have supplied the exhibitions at the British Institution from year to year; the National Gallery had been very beneficial ... ". A later witness, Joseph Clinton Robertson, (who "conducts the *Mechanic's Magazine* ") said that although he believed that the mechanics classes generally had good taste already, more than "the persons of Wapping," that the "Westend" was more cultivated than Wapping. He lamented that wages in England were too high compared with abroad inferring, perhaps, that this stops the working classes going to museums. Further, exhibitions improved the "public's eyes" and "hence the superiority of the educated and travelled classes in all that regards matters of taste."[p.498] Morrison too agreed that the cultivation of taste was lacking in England due to the want of elementary education, "but it is chiefly because fine examples of art are not constantly before their eyes."

Twenty five years later, Sir Thomas Wyse,^{PP}[p.397], was telling the Select Committee on the British Museum [1860b, p.426], that during his eleven years as envoy and Minister in Athens, he paid great attention to

the antiquities.'⁸ Wyse said there was no museum worthy of the name in Greece and that those that existed were confusedly arranged. There was also a dispute between the Government and local government as to who should be the proprietors of remains, as at Sparta and Mega. Museums, however, were a growing phenomenon, as he said, "I have travelled over all Greece on horseback, and visited with care all their principle towns. I found in most the commencement of a local museum, under the direction of a priest or teacher." [p.427] Two other witnesses, Layard and Charles Fellows, both complained that they had sent over foreign acquisitions but that the British Museum had not consulted them about the arrangement of them. During the years between 1830 and 1860, there was some criticism of foreign museums. In 1841, J.E. Grey, of the British Museum, said that attendants abroad were much stricter, were always telling people off and would not let you write things down. [Parliamentary Papers, 1841, p.613] In Vienna, you have a guide, as in the Tower of London and in Munich you cannot wander freely. Grey contended that the lower classes in England were well-behaved when visiting the British Museum and that "they appear to consider it a privilege." (We will discuss views on the behaviour of visitors later.)

John Ruskin, some years later, said that you could tell an English working class visitor to a museum as opposed to the same who was French, because whereas the former wore a dirty, ragged shirt with similar hair and coat, the latter wore the dress of a profession, a blue smock for example. ^{PP} [1860a, Select Committee on evening opening of museums etc. p.132] French workmen in the Louvre, said Ruskin, have more self-respect than the same classes in the National Gallery in London. When it was put to him that he had surely never seen an upper class man scorn a working

man because of his dress when in the National Gallery, Ruskin replied, "I have certainly seen working men apprehensive of such scorn." When asked about the Crystal Palace, where "all classes meet there together", Ruskin simply said that he was sure "that a working man very often would not go where he would like to go." From Ruskin's observations, museums had not become places where the working classes felt comfortable, (despite "efforts" of the *Penny Magazine* nearly thirty years before.) Ruskin was talking about national museums, but noted a lack of pride amongst working people since industrialisation. Other commentators on museums, however, contended that museums in manufacturing towns would lead to a civic pride. Labouchere, using the Continent to illustrate his meaning, said 'museums could be monuments to the entrepreneurial spirit and individual advancement, for:

No Englishman could travel on the Continent without being struck by the circumstance of finding in every considerable town that he came to a museum, in which any object of antiquity, which might exist near the locality, was almost sure to be preserved. The consequence of having such an institution in a place was, that if any of the inhabitants happened to prosper in the world, and to become possessed of some valuable work of art, he almost invariably bequeathed it to the museum of the town in which he and his ancestors resided ...
[H, 6/3/45, p.393]

Travellers brought back descriptions of museums abroad. Comparisons were used in Select Committees on museums from the 1830's onwards and also in parliamentary debate, (as in 1845). Links were made between these and industrial competition as well as ideas on progress and civilisation. In the following descriptions of travellers, we shall see an example from working class travellers sent abroad by The Society of Arts in order to make industrial comparisons between France and Britain.

Travellers and Access to Collections

Access to art collections, especially in the early years of the 19th Century, was very poor and "only those who could travel abroad could hope to see the great works of European painting." [Boase, 1959, p.278] Private collections (in England also), presented their difficulties too. James Silk Buckingham, (1786-1853), M.P. for Sheffield, 1832 to 1837, wrote an account of his European tour which is packed with comments on the numerous galleries, museums and libraries he visited. He began by explaining the motives for foreign travel which are, "wealth, pleasure, science, commerce, war and necessity," and these "are often combined." [Buckingham, p.1] Essentials are few; a small baggage, letters of introduction and a good companion.

He compares the classes in England and Ghent saying class contact is a good thing:

The public promenades ... afford the inhabitants of every class the pleasure of air and exercise, without cost or inconvenience and between the richer and poorer inhabitants the exchange of civilities and courtesies often takes place in these public walks - a much more agreeable thing to witness than the distance which separates the higher and lower classes in all crowded assemblies in England,
(Buckingham, no date, p55)

As a politician he says he devoted himself chiefly "to the framing and passing of measures of philanthropy rather than of political change such as the Abolition of Impressment, Flogging, Capital Punishment and Dwelling ..., The construction of Baths, Public Parks, and Gardens, and local Museums and Libraries for the labouring classes ... " [Buckingham, Appendix. A letter to Lord John Russell 1846 p. 17] Charity was a true source of happiness.

Buckingham also compares the openness of the Academy of Painting at Brussels with its public lectures, with that of England and advocates the same for London and provincial towns.¹⁹ He sees travel as vital to museums and other institutions and recommended that museums in England should have special travellers like the Senkerberg Museum of Natural History. Indeed, "the treasures of art, science, literature, and social economy might be all increased by such a step." [p.366] Money could be raised to fund travellers, by a city banquet. The British Museum, however, could spare some of its money to pay a traveller to bring it descriptions of foreign manuscripts and curiosities. Even Parliament, said Buckingham, should have one to research into the laws of other countries.

One of the more interesting places he describes was the Royal Cabinet of Curiosities in the Hague with its 745 objects all existing from Holland's connections with Japan, China and India. This and the Picture Gallery, he said, "occupied us fully for the day." [p.374] and of the former, that there was "an esprit de corps prevailing among the functionaries employed by both the Dutch East India Company and the State, almost everyone going to or returning from their Eastern possessions has contributed something to this collection." [p.371] It included Number 641, 'The Crown of the King of Arda,' conquered by Admiral De Ruyter; Number 566, A Silver Hatchet presented by the miners of Saxony to the King of Holland; Number 653, part of the Bed of Peter The Great of Russia; Number 717A, a square case richly adorned, containing a piece of native gold presented by the Dutch East India Company to William IV. Leyden's Museum of Natural History, where he saw many other specimens sent from colonial military and civilians, suggested to Buckingham that Britain was behind Holland in this respect and that

Government and Universities should send travellers to research into Natural History. Britain and France, however, was superior to Holland in the "large monuments of Egyptian sculpture. Colonial connections provided valuable artifacts for museums in Europe and they could also open doors, (literally). On a visit to the Japanese Museum of Dr. Siebold, Buckingham found only the bottom floor open and the attendant, who explained everything to them, told them that the choicest objects were unfortunately upstairs. Dr. Siebold had been at the "Dutch Factory" at Desima in Japan, for a long time and had collected "specimens of all their manufactures, implements, articles of domestic use, and many other objects of great interest and curiosity." [p.424] While they were there, Dr. Siebold himself came in and Buckingham wrote:

I introduced myself to him by the presentation of my card, and mentioned my having been in India for some years, when he told me that he was not only familiar with my name, but my history - that the *Calcutta Journal* was well known in all the Dutch Factories in the Indian Seas during his residence there ...

(Buckingham, no date, p424)

After telling Buckingham that he wanted to make his stay agreeable, he took him up to the unopened rooms where the objects were undergoing re-arrangement for cataloguing.²⁰

William Ewart went to Paris in 1821 and after several months there, he "bought a carriage, hired a servant and began on his Tour." [Munford, 1960, p.30] In his letters home, he described the people he met and the paintings and monuments he saw. Travelling through Italy and Germany, he met and socialised with Charles Eastlake, and also undertook a trip to Italy where he stayed for a number of years. His first trips, however, were to Paris in 1814 and 1815 where he saw the Louvre full of

Napoleon's acquisitions which gave him an "historical curiosity".[Robertson, 1978, p.6] Attracted by the idea of the antiquities in Rome, he went there in 1816 and met many society people and fellow artists, including Cockerell, the Scandanavian sculptor and collector Thorwaldsen and the German, Nazarenes, (also Cornelius, who later came over to England to advise the Fine Art Commission on fresco.) Robertson goes as far as to say: 'To the Germans at Rome, Eastlake owed ... his first awareness of the new art-history. No longer could a serious student discount as merely "curious" works produced in the so-called 'Dark Ages.'"[p.11] Later, as Director of the National Gallery, he began to buy "Early or Thirteenth and fourteenth century Italian Art. In 1818 He went to Greece and later returned to Italy where he met Sir George Beaumont who was interested in the formation of a National Gallery in London. (He also offered some of his own collection if Government bought Angerstein's.) Eastlake also met Samuel Rogers, dealer and later trustee of the National Gallery. When Eastlake toured Holland and Germany in the late 1820's, he made copious notes about Dutch and Flemish art. In Berlin, Waagen, who was preparing the Solly collection for the opening of the Royal Berlin Gallery, made it accessible to Eastlake and a long friendship followed.

Of course, foreign travel was not the exclusive domain of the upper classes, for soldiers, sailors, emigrants and convicts of the lower classes all went far afield. In his autobiography, the weaver Joseph Gutteridge, (1816-1899), tells of a Mr. Toogood who along with others, was transported after a factory was wrecked by the workers in new larger looms and the workers accused of employing women at a cheap rate. He later revisited his town of Coventry "a comparatively rich man." Not only that, but:

He brought with him a quantity of natural curiosities - skins of birds and animals, planks of various valuable woods, native implements and weapons of warfare and of the chase, besides a varied assortment of curios from different parts of the vast continent of Australia. For the accommodation of these curiosities, J, at the recommendation of one of his friends, made him some show cases,
[Ed, Valerie E, Chancellor, 1969, p.101]

Both William Andrews, (1835-1914), later a Coventry businessman and Tory Councillor, and Joseph Gutteridge, visited The Great Exhibition in London (and both later travelled abroad.) Andrews went with seven others as a prize from the School of Design and in London he visited Westminster Abbey, The National Gallery, British Museum and the Zoological Gardens. He had joined The Mechanics' Institute and in 1855, won an £8 prize for his designs to allow him to go to the Paris Exhibition. Although his account is very sparse, we learn that he went abroad again in 1860 after losing his job. He went 'to penetrate the enemy camp' with a promise from his last employer that if he brought back information about foreign designs, he could have his old job back.[p.41] His account of his life in his diary is short and consists generally of bald statements of fact, for example, about his weight, times of trains, how far he has walked and about money. (In 1860, when a close childhood friend, who he still saw, died, the nearest he comes to emotion was that his last words were "Call my mother" and that "J.A. was 11 days younger than myself." [p.39]) He does list some visits including one to the 1857 Art Treasures Exhibition in Manchester, Peel Park and Museum, and another to Chatsworth. He came from a less poor and more stable background than Gutteridge, who gives a fuller account of his life. He was educated at a Dame School where, like Charles Shaw in the Potteries, he learned knitting. He also used pub and ship signs as a "means of

learning."[p.85] His trip to London in 1851, was part of a works trip and he says it "was the longest journey I had ever undertaken." Although he had a lifelong interest in Natural History, he regretted that books on science were too expensive. Like Shaw, he deplored the effects of drink on factory workers and the monotony of factory life. The "immoral" results of the factory made him resolve to stay out of them and weave at home and despite some extreme poverty, when he was tempted to steal bread, would rather have starved than go on the parish.[p.123] Early on, he read Thomas Paine, joined a discussion group and a Coventry Mutual Improvement Class to get "mental relief". Later, he became a Christian because he said if there was belief, there was also hope for the future. He felt his progress with Natural History and entomology was slow, due to lack of time in which to look for specimens. However, he went on to say, because:

If I had no other hobby to engage my attention beyond working, eating, and sleeping, I must have given up. But in summer time, when the labour of the day was done at 5 o'clock, I was off to the lanes and fields ... To this love of natural products ... do I in great measure ascribe the fortitude with which I was able to bear up against the many difficulties and trials that beset us in life ... "

(Ed. Chancellor, 1969, p183)

His interest led him to meet people from "higher stations in life" who came to see his collections. A Dr. Coulcher was told of it through a medical friend of Gutteridge's and "he called upon me to examine my little collection of fossils of the Warwickshire coalfield."[p.143] Sometimes, he had to start his collection "afresh" as lack of money compelled him to sell it. Many of his specimens, he found on river shores and in gravel pits. When his first wife died and he went to stay with friends on a farm in a Leicestershire village, he found fossils whilst walking the four miles from the station. People thought he was mad to carry such

"rubbish", but "the farm house was also the village Inn, at which club meetings were held. Next evening, the room was crowded with visitors - the fame of my eccentricities having spread abroad - to listen to my explanations ... "[p.147-8] While there, he visited the Leicester museum describing it as "The first attraction" in which "the rooms were richly stored with mementoes of the past history of this old town, illustrative of its successful occupation by Briton, Roman, Saxon and Dane."[p.150] It was through a museum that he met his second wife. Around 1857, an anatomical museum opened in Coventry, which Gutteridge describes as having a:

Comprehensive and excellent collection, which afforded me an opportunity of supplementing previous knowledge of the human frame gleaned from books and diagrams by reference to carefully prepared specimens; the hours spent there were among the most pleasant of my life. Some lady friends from Bedworth whom I knew were visiting the museum on a special day set apart for ladies, and going for tea afterwards at the house of a mutual friend, they sent for me to explain the various objects they had seen ...

(Ed. Chancellor, 1969, p172)

When a market hall was opened in Coventry in 1867, there was an exhibition to commemorate it and Gutteridge lent the microscope he had made. The exhibition was a success and made £1,000 profit. This was also the year of the Paris Exhibition and the Society of Arts asked Coventry to recommend two workers from the ribbon and watch trades who were "fit and proper", to go. As Gutteridge put it "... the Society of Arts in London had raised funds to enable English artisans connected with various trades to visit the Paris Exhibition and report with a view to comparing conditions of labour and production in the two countries."[p.184] He adds, "we visited most of the sights of Paris as well as the Exhibition."[p.185] He found that the French had a "laxity of morals" and the Fete of St.

Cloud in the park attached to the Palace, was "an ogre(sic) of uncontrolled passion." This upset him so much that he left without seeing the Palace's treasures and art works which he said he was longing to see. He did not like the way French workers toiled on Sundays and sold photographs, "many of which would not have been tolerated in Holywell Street in its worst days." He did, however, meet M. Haussoullier, the British Commissioner, who he liked and found they had a common interest, for he collected "numerous articles of vertu, minerals, fossils and curiosities of every kind ... "

The two workmen were let down by those who had sent them and were not given money promised them so that the trip left them out of pocket. Gutteridge said the agent at Coventry treated their complaints "laughingly" so he withheld *his report of his findings and eventually got* his money. He kept the report, however, and later said "its interest has now passed away." (The rhetoric and apparent conviction of the 1830's and 1840's seem to have made way for an amount of complacency.) While still abroad, Gutteridge says he heard exciting news:

On reaching Paris from Geneva, we found a letter awaiting us describing a public meeting at Coventry in favour of the adoption of a Free Library and Museum Act, and informing us that we had both been chosen as working men representatives to act on the Committee. This was a source of gratification to us, and I am still a member of that Committee.
(Ed. Chancellor, 1969, p200)

Three years later, in 1870, he went to Great Horton in Bradford, to work at an exhibition which was extended from three to four months as it was so popular. Here he worked a loom for Thomas Stevens from Coventry and also displayed what he made. While in the area, Gutteridge visited Halifax Museum, describing it as good for a "local enterprise",[p.219] and he saw

weapons, armour and gold and silver ornaments on loan from South Kensington. The Great Horton Exhibition made £2,000, was considered a success and had been "well patronised by the nobility and gentry of the West Riding."

Joseph Gutteridge donated parts of his collection to the Coventry Museum. For him, collecting was part of his education and the aim of education was to divert men from drink. He had considered selling his collection in the 1890's as he needed money to live on, but he was persuaded by friends to donate it to the museum for the future of Coventry in the hope that it would be a part of an educational centre. This would "check, in some small degree, the growing tendency to venial pleasures among the young and thoughtless ... "(Ed. Chancellor, 1969, p232)

Joseph Gutteridge was chosen as a respectable workman to go abroad in 1867. Indeed, he was the sort of working class man who could easily have given evidence to Select Committees on the educational and moral worth of museums. He would have been asked questions anticipating an echo in reply and would have reiterated the politicians views on self-improvement. But his experience when he returned from his foreign trip in 1867, has another possible explanation, apart from complacency and that is that workers were not taken seriously when they were asked to present independent reports on the state of industry and so forth. The trip made workmen appear to be part of an overall industrial directing force, but this instance suggests the degree of importance which some gave them. In the field of natural history, indeed, many working class men were considered experts. We now turn to this topic and its relation to working class men and museums.

Natural History

Natural history was presented as a more democratic interest than art in the 19th Century. Specimens as objects of curiosity, have a long history. They were used as crowd-pullers in Churches, (see Mordaunt-Crook, 1972, p.22) and in 16th Century Italy, there were numerous private natural history museums resulting from scientific inquiry and these were in the home of the collectors. Kenneth Hudson('75) believes "there was no agreed taste relating to stuffed birds, no connoisseurship of Pacific Islands, weapons or costumes. The non-art museum, therefore, rests on foundations which were, at least potentially more democratic."(p.19-24) Conversations that Gutteridge had with both the Commissioner in Paris and his boss, on the subject of natural history, tend to confirm this. Yet, Gutteridge suffered the hardships of lack of time, space and money, which separate him from middle and upper class collectors. There is also other evidence suggesting that working class men studied natural history to educate themselves. In 1835, when the weaver was nineteen, Mr. Eld, the Mayor of Coventry, gave evidence to the Select Committee. He said there was no picture collection in the place.²¹ There were however said Eld, "some collections of natural history principally of birds at PP Coventry."(1835, p.414) Mrs Gaskell, a keen observer of those around her in Manchester wrote about working class collectors in *Mary Barton*(1979)

There is a class of men in Manchester, unknown even to many of the inhabitants, and whose existence will probably be doubted by many, who yet may claim kindred with all the noble names that science recognises ... They are scattered all over the manufacturing districts of Lancashire ... It is perhaps less astonishing that the more popularly interesting branches of natural history have their warm and devoted followers among this class. There are botanists ... who know the name and habitat of every plant within a days walk from their dwellings ... There are entomologists who may be seen with a rude-looking net, ready

to catch any winged insect ... Sir J.E. Smith being on a visit to Roscoe, of Liverpool, made some inquiries from him as to the habitat of a very rare plant ... Mr Roscoe ... stated that if any one could give him the the desired information, it would be a hand-loom weaver in Manchester whom he named, Sir J.E. Smith proceeded by coach to Manchester and on arriving at that town, he inquired of the porter ... if he could direct him to so and so, "Oh yes," replied the man, "He does a bit in my way;"It turned out that both the porter and his friend, the weaver, were skilful botanists, and able to give Sir J.E. Smith the very information he wanted.
[p.75-6. See n. 21, p.476, Sir James Edward Smith, 1759-1828, wrote books on botany, Roscoe is William Roscoe, 1735-1831, Passavant went to see him just before he died to see his Raphael drawings, Vol.11, p.12ff)

Old Job Leigh, a character in *Mary Barton*, had a collection of "weird-looking creatures that sprawled around the room in their roughly-made glass cases." He knew all the technical names and went to the Liverpool docks in Whitsun week to pick up specimens from sailors "who often bring some queer thing or another from the hot countries they go to,...[77]. One, a scorpion, bought for two shillings who had found it dead and put it in a bottle for he knew "There were folks enow who would give him something for him." (It came alive with the heat of the room when Job took it home but he boils it and sends his grand-daughter to the pub for some gin to preserve it.)

J.E. Grey, giving evidence in 1841 and advocating Sunday opening of museums, said that when he was a doctor working in Spitalfields he saw many working class people toiling in their gardens on Sunday or going to the countryside to collect natural history specimens. Thus "if you are in search of a rare British insect or bird you will probably find it among these men."([*Parliamentary Papers*, 1841, 616] The literature designed for artisans included natural history as part of their approach. In the *Penny Magazine* there were articles on various plants and animals, for example,

goats, elephants and cameleopard. (The latter brought to the British Museum by Mr. Burchell, a traveller in Africa, and put on the stairs - *Penny Magazine*, No. 15, June 30, pp.124-5) Even here we can see the pushing of the ideas of political economy and that the white man and his civilisation are superior. In an article called 'The Banana Plantation' [No. 31, Sept 29, pp.252-3] we are told that the fact that the plant grows so easily;

...has doubtless contributed to arrest the progress of improvement in tropical regions. In the new continent civilisation first commenced on the mountains, in a soil of inferior fertility. Necessity awakens industry, and industry calls forth the intellectual powers of the human race. When these are developed, man does not sit in a cabin, gathering the fruits of his little patch of bananas asking no greater luxuries, and proposing no higher ends of life than to eat and to sleep ... he carries his industry forward to its utmost limits, by the consideration that he has active duties to perform. The idleness of the poor Indian keeps him where he has been for ages, little elevated above the inferior animal; - The industry of The European, under his colder skies, and with less fertile soil, has surrounded him with all the blessings of society - its comforts, its affections, its virtues, and its intellectual riches.

In 1860, the Select Committee on the British Museum [*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860b, p.176] reported that natural history was a subject for all those of "ordinary intelligence" and that;

It appears from evidence, that many of the middle classes are in the habit of forming collections in various branches of Natural History, and that many even of the working classes employ their holidays in the study of botany or geology, or in the collection of insects obtained in the neighbourhood of London; that they refer to the British Museum in order to ascertain the proper classification of the specimens thus obtained, and that want of leisure alone restrains the further increase of this class of visitor,

The Committee explored the possibility of moving the Natural History collection to other sites including South Kensington (where it eventually went in 1881). Generally, witnesses had said it was the most popular

collection and one reason given was the beauty of the plumage of the birds which was "calculated to attract and amuse spectators"[p.175] The Principal Librarian of the British Museum did a survey between 13.6.60 and 11.7.60 and found over 220% more people in this section than in the Library and 33% more than was in the Gallery of Antiquities. The question of moving the collection involved consideration of money, risks of damage, the centrality of the (then) present site, the fact that the collection was too big and confusing as it was and that a move would ease things for other British Museum Departments. The Committee was against the mixture of art and natural history, criticising the display of the portraits of "eminent personages" as being incongruous. Layard also comments that art should be separate and "the visitor should not be introduced to the art department through a line of rhinoceroses and giraffes, as they are now."[p.381] Eastlake, another witness, said he would like the drawings from the museum but would need to discuss whether manuscripts were part of the history of art. Thus he is seeing the National Gallery's collection in terms of its illustrating art history.(PP, 1860b, p384)

The Natural History collection originally contained much from Hans Sloane, which was later sold or destroyed, but by the mid-19th century everything was being preserved causing the overcrowding. Professor Owen, Superintendent of the Department, said that varieties within species were as important as different species and comparisons were important. Systematic exhibitions were necessary to "show the way in which one order is modified and has a transition into another."[p.181] (It is tempting to see similarities between this evolutionary approach and the history of art being shown at the National Gallery.) Owen wanted two

types of exhibition - popular and scientific. The former would use taxidermy to attract attention and the latter would be based on storage for study.^[22]

Two other witnesses in 1860 - "scientific naturalists" called Waterhouse and Sciater - disagreed, however, with a systematic approach. They agreed with presenting "real" backgrounds but thought a type collection would be vague and would mean the same thing to any two men. The overcrowding in the British Museum was, according to Mordaunt-Crook, due to excavations abroad and donations. (These included Layard's Assyrian sculptures, Fellowes' Lycian Marbles, Rowlinson's Assyrian finds and many others). This led to "prestige and congestion".

Collecting

Many writers about museums attempt to describe why collectors collect. There are bizarre stories like that of M.A.C. Hinton who worked at the Natural History Museum being found after his death to have amassed over 10,000 tobacco tins. Ripley (1970) attributes the creation of cultures to "the collecting instinct" which he says fires a universal activity. Just as they collect shells in New Guinea, "A museum seems to represent the inheritance of the oldest instincts of mankind."^[p.23] The universal human trait is seen not only as an instinct reaching back to the "cave" but also as something existing at different levels of progress - retarded or developed. Ideas associated with 'universals' are very often ideas of relative progress.

Hudson (1975) sees 18th century collectors as enthusiasts who built up collections and who became more and more "men with the desire to possess".[p.5] Passavant too, talking about the "rage for collecting original drawings by great masters," which was "extreme" by the 1830's, attributes it to "the general desire for accumulation, so characteristic of the English..." The result of this was that "Most of the private collections in Italy, France, and Germany, have been obliged to surrender their treasures before the power of English gold;..."[Passavant, Vol 1, 1978, p.234] Hudson quotes from Lord Clark who like Ripley makes no national distinctions and who calls collecting "a biological function, not unrelated to our physical appetites" akin to "The miser's instinct". Clark also describes how Mr Gulbenkian who was loth to show his collection would say, "Would I admit a stranger to my harem?" There were also two great collectors who "like Sardanapalus and his wives wanted their collections to be destroyed when they died." Clark has some sympathy with this feeling, for, he says that great collections are often made by men of high office whose only friends may be their pictures.[Hudson, 1975, p.5 from Lord Clark's introduction to *Great Private Collections* by Douglas Cooper, 1963, p.15] It is astonishing to see from such an extract how Lord Clark equates the possession of paintings *and* women. The effect is lessened, however, when one sees how well he appears to understand the connections between power, status and property.

Not all collectors were loth to open their collections. Joseph Mayer (1803-1886) originally from Newcastle-Under-Lyme went to Liverpool as an apprentice goldsmith, became rich and a local politician and benefactor. As early as 1828 he travelled abroad and he gave the Mechanics' School of Art (founded 1825 and in 1832 renamed the Liverpool Mechanics'

Institution) four books on the arts and eight plaster casts of antique sculpture. After this he went abroad on numerous occasions and bought medals and miniatures. As he became more successful in business he began to buy collections of Egyptian antiquities (now in the Liverpool County Museum) and Bronze Age pottery.[see Susan Nicholson and Margaret Warhurst, 1984, p.4] He sent some of his own work to The Great Exhibition and six years later was to lay the foundation stone of the Liverpool museum and library.²³

Mayer was willing to loan objects; vases, in 1838, to the Newcastle-Under-Lyme Mechanics' Union which held an exhibition and pottery in 1842 to the Liverpool Mechanics' Institution (for which he wrote the catalogue and where he stated a belief in free public museums.) He opened his own Egyptian Museum, at 8 Colquitt St. in 1852 which was "a popular success".[Nicholson and Warhurst, p.6] Engravings of the interior show cases from the floor almost to the ceiling. In the *Preface to the Catalogue* Mayer wrote;

...it is with a view to add his mite to the gratification of those who have not had an opportunity of visiting the great collection of antiquity in the British Museum ... that the proprietor of this museum has placed within the reach of the student and the antiquary, the opportunity of examining its contents, which he hopes will serve as the groundwork for those who are desirous of seeing the high state of civilisation which the Egyptians had attained ... and probably be the string by which some of our townsmen may be led to a study of the same.

[In Nicholson & Warhurst, 1984, p.6]

He gave conducted tours to children from the Blue Coat Hospital School and also "a large piece of bun loaf" each. He regretted charging the public one shilling (6d for under twelves) but did so to cover running costs. When his collection (of over 14,000 items) went to the Liverpool

museum in 1867 it attracted 16,000 on the first day. Mayer also involved himself in the Local Board of Health and gas and water supplies and in 1866 used his own money (later a trust) to open a public library and park in Bebington (which passed to the Local Authority in 1930). He also built Mayer Hall for public meetings and entertainment and continued to donate to the museum. His epitaph ran:

He strove to enrich in History, Letters and Art,
The Town of his birth,
The City where he lived,
The Village where he died,

(The collection of Henry Blundell d,1810 is also in the Liverpool County Museum. He knew Charles Townley and sent agents to Italy to buy for him. At first he allowed anyone to visit but closed it to all except scholars after a boy damaged one of the statues. Even now, says the museum, most of the collection is only seen by scholars and its interest is in being an example of an 18th Century 'man of taste'. On show, you see many classical plaster casts of the collection. Passavant Vol II p,724 describes the collection at Ince Hall near Liverpool of a Mr C. Blundell,)

Thorwaldsen (1771-1844) was another collector, perhaps more eccentric than Mayer who set up a museum of his collection for the public. He was a sculptor who spent 23 years in Italy (where he met English dealers and also Charles Eastlake) and the collection includes much of his own work. He bequeathed his collection to "form a museum, which shall bear my name. The museum shall never be united, nor shall it be lessened, divided, or modified under any pretext whatsoever." [Eugene Plon, 1874, p.123] His will, made in 1837 when Rome was going through a cholera epidemic, asked for a small charge for admission from which artists would be exempt. The money would pay for a custodian. It opened in Copenhagen in 1848. (Mayer went there in 1854. It would be interesting to know if he visited the museum.) It shows antique works and paintings

including renaissance and contemporary, and he left nearly half a million francs. (For an idea of the layout of the museum see *The Thorwaldsen Museum. Illustrated Official Guide*, T.H. Oppermann, pub J. Jorgensen & Co., Ivar Jantzen, Copenhagen, 1931.)

In 1835 *and* quite recently on television (BBC2 *The Great Collectors*, 14.7.85.) there were statements made about possessing art. Waagen, in his evidence to the Select Committee, said that, in Berlin, the schools of design had inspired in "the people a great desire to possess works of art." [*Parliamentary Papers*, 1835, p.383] The recent example is of the American collector and millionaire McIlvenny (whose father collected Renaissance art and left it to the Philadelphia Art Society). He sits on the board of an art museum. In the 1930's he took a museum course and his teacher (Saxe), also a collector, made the students feel that art works were *available* and to be acquired. McIlvenny concentrated on French art and talked of Toulouse-Lautrec's *Dance at the Moulin-Rouge* (which he bought in 1930) as cheap at 42,000 dollars. What Waagen omits is to describe the people who desired to have art works, what they desired and also whether they managed to fulfil their desires. From these two examples it could be said that the exposure to art stimulates that old collecting instinct we have had since the dawn of man. But this analysis fails to consider some important factors; who is allowed, by wealth, time and space to collect and the differences in what is collected at different times. It is simply not accurate to describe collecting solely in terms of universal urges. Mayer, for example, had the money to travel and to collect because he created a successful business in the 19th Century and it was *then* that the National Gallery began to buy "early" Italian "primitives". Art was coming to be included in an educational and

industrial strategy and with this there was the growth of the art expert and attempts at a more systematic history of art. (See also George Savage, 1969, Reitlinger, 1961-1970 for examples of how the art market developed and changed.)

Steegman (1971) notes also the increasing demands in the 19th Century for contemporary British art; Wilkie, Frith, Landseer, Callcott and many others. Main collectors of these were successful businessmen and entrepreneurs and also Prince Albert. The self-made man, says Steegman, felt that Old Masters were risky. There was general agreement against buying Turner and Constable and there was greater assurance in contemporary works that the new entrepreneur could relate to. Although, Steegman believes, this collecting was "as it may be in any age, the (1971 desire for rivalry and emulation" p.53) and that for a long time collectors of modern works were, in the early parts of the century, "not (1971 yet admitted into the hierarchy of connoisseurs". p.58) (By the middle of the century some experts, eg. Layard, began to advocate buying modern art.) Waagen (Vol I, p.36) notes that the English school was by 1854 more popular and had "exceedingly increased." Passavant noted how it was socially important to have the "due number of paintings" and recounts;

As an agreeable exception, however, to the crowd of amateurs, who exchange good gold for bad pictures, and the *coûte qui coûte* insist on their being admired, I must mention a certain General, who, according to the fashion of the day had furnished his house with a due number of paintings; always, however, restricting his purchase to those which bore the lowest prices. An honest artist to whom he was exhibiting these pieces of furniture, and whose opinion he enquired, very candidly avowed that he did not consider any one of them to be of value. "Well, you are right enough," said the General; "They cost me but a trifle; but such as they are they find plenty of admirers and as I don't understand pictures, I'm perfectly satisfied." (1978, Vol I, pp.274-51

T.H.S. Escott, (1885), too describes collectors. In a chapter on 'Towns of Business' he compares and contrasts Birmingham and Manchester. As Birmingham is a place with many small industries it has quiet connoisseurs who "lovingly" collect for themselves and live unostentatiously whereas in Lancashire where there are a fewer number of larger industries, the capitalist surrounds himself with 'ready-made' collections of furniture and ornament with no history "of memories and associations." And the chase to possess has been "more pleasurable than the possession,"[Escott, p.91] and as Passavant says, they are just "pieces of furniture" or cyphers. Escott does add, however, that both Manchester and Birmingham have reputations for radical measures including education, libraries, picture galleries and institutions.

The collection of Prince Albert included contemporary, but also early Dutch art (Van Eyck, Roger Van der Weyden etc.) which went to the National Gallery when he died. It also had "Early" Italian (Duccio, Fra Angelico, Gentile da Fabriano) "which hardly anyone else at that time would have dreamt of buying." [Steegman 1971, p.60] He had an agent in Italy (as did the National Gallery - Otto Mündler, employed on the initiative of Eastlake but later dispensed with by the Government on the grounds of cost. See D. Robertson 1978)

Peel collected 16th and 17th century Dutch and Italian many of which were given to the National Gallery and he considered pre-Renaissance art as "curiosities".²⁴ Hudson, (1975), describes collectors as "essentially robbers and destroyers,"[p.12] and he says that the Elgin Marbles were "filched" from the Parthenon.[p.39] For many reasons, however, the excavators and archaeologists who sent many objects from abroad would not have agreed. Sir Henry Layard increased the British

Museum's collection by a thousand-fold with his taking objects from Mesopotamia in the 1840's. The soldiers, scholars and diplomats included Col. Rawlinson in Mesopotamia (British Consul in Baghdad) who deciphered cuneiform script. C.T. Newton (later Sir Charles) who had been an assistant at the British Museum 1840-1852 was later Vice Consul at Mybiline and the Consul at Rome. In the Levant he did a special service mission for the British Museum in Budrum and in 1860 while in Rome valued the Campana collection for them. (see Robertson, 1978, pp.193-5) C.R. Cockerell, too, was a noted collector and was celebrated for his 'finds' including the Aegina and Phigaleian marbles bought by the British Museum for £19,000. For this Eastlake thought him "one of the cleverest men at Rome." (Robertson, 1978, p.10)

Waagen, too, describes how these types of acquisition can be the spoils of war and imperial conquest. The Rosetta Stone reached the British Museum in this way. The French collected it "during their dominion of Alexandria, in 1801, [and it] came into the possession of the English by the intervention of Nelson." (Waagen¹⁸⁵⁴ Vol.2, p.42, See Ch III) Greek and Roman collections were also enlarged by the purchase of Charles Townley's collection.²⁵

It was the Elgin Marbles that finally meant that the Dept. of Antiquities "was raised to the highest importance, as a collection of antique sculpture." (pp.14-15) The separate department had been created in 1807 and a special Townley gallery built 1806-8 to cope with growing acquisition. The Government paid £35,000 after a Select Committee had reported in favour of the purchase. (*Parliamentary Papers*, 1816, I p.258, II p.239) Its report was published for J. Taylor in *The Elgin Marbles*, 1816, where the introduction praises Elgin himself for "rescuing these precious

remains of an ancient art from the destroying hand of time and from the more destroying hand of an uncivilised people." [See Boase, 1959, n1, p.132] Sixteen years later *The Penny Magazine* praised the Committee of the House of Commons on their decision and said they were the "best qualified to judge" the marbles which were a perfect mix of nature and ideality and too much naturalism was vulgar. Indeed, we had acquired them "by the taste, patriotism and enterprise of the Earl of Elgin." [No.46, Dec 22, pp.371-2]⁴⁶

The question of foreign acquisition reappeared in *The Penny Magazine's* series on the British Museum. The building of a room for the Marbles was deemed "a proper appropriation of the public wealth" for "one of the most judicious measures of Government with reference to the advancement of the Arts in this country, was the purchase of these remains." [No.28, Sept 8, pp.228-9] (The magazine later apologised for showing the illustration of the wrong Greek temple - were the Greeks as ignorant as portrayed?) Eastlake called the Parthenon in 1818 "The very essence of everything classic". [D. Robertson, 1978, p.15] D. Horne, 1984, however, wrote recently:

Would we admire the Parthenon if it still had a roof, and no longer appealed to the modern stereotype for an outline emerging from rough stone? If we repainted it in its original red, blue and gold, and if we re-installed the huge, gaudy cult-figure of Athena, festooned in bracelets, rings and necklaces, we could not avoid the question that threatens our whole concept of the classical; *did the Greeks have bad taste?*
[p.29]

He also says that in the 1950's the Armenian School of Classical Studies at Athens spent \$1½ million building a copy of the Stoa of Attalus in the old market place, it was copied to every detail *except*

"they couldn't bring themselves to paint it red and blue as it had been in the original." The artisans are told that Elgin was a hero for if he had not saved the Marbles "There would not have been a fragment left at this day to exhibit the grandeur of Grecian art as practised by Phidias." [*The Penny Magazine*, No.28, p.22] They are also a purchase of the British nation and of "inestimable value." Other articles followed on the Portland Vase [No.31, Sept.29] and the Gallery of Athenian Antiquities [No.38, Nov.3] (Waagen praised this gallery and admired its overhead lighting, Vol.1, Ch III) The Marbles were arranged in the order they appeared on the Parthenon, yet it must have been difficult to imagine them in situ from this jigsaw. There were also, in the same room, "Fragments removed from other public buildings in Athens." [No.38, Nov.3] *The Penny Magazine* tells the reader *not* to be put off by the fact that at first glance they may be uninteresting. (Rather in the same way that children must learn to acquire adult tastes) This is inevitable "To a mind uninstructed in the taste for appreciating the higher excellences of art..." The remedy for this is to "let the spectator who has a growing feeling for what is grand in art, but who is unable to divest himself of painful associations connected with the dilapidated condition of these sculptures, visit the gallery again and again." Models of the Elgin Marbles came to be in great demand. John Hennings (who we saw as a witness in 1835) first carved them in intaglio then as a frieze on the Athenaeum and in the Hyde Park Arch. Boase also says that "many a Regency interior showed friezes of horsemen, either in relief or as wallpaper; and on ... monuments ..." [p.133] Waagen wrote about their importance, in that their exhibition in London had led to the

"distribution of plaster casts of them all over Europe." Indeed, he believes "civilised Europe" is the best place for them:

In my opinion these works are as far superior to all the antique sculptures before discovered, with very few exceptions, as the works of Homer to the later Greeks and Roman poems. The acquisition of them by civilised Europe is, therefore, of as much importance, with respect to the fine arts of antiquity as it would be with respect to ancient poetry, if the works of Homer had been lost, and considerable fragments of them only found in later days in the library of some Greek monastery,
[Vol.1 p,32]

In 1860 we find Sir Thomas Wyse also talking about Greek antiquities and the difficulty of exporting them. Government permission and a report from the Director of Antiquities was needed but private excavations were so numerous and scattered that it was impossible to stop the smaller items from illegal exportation.[Parl. Papers 1860b, p.426] He also said that he had heard Greeks saying that they should have their antiquities returned but that he thought that "we" saved them from destruction by the Turks, that the Greeks had mistreated them and did not understand the importance of the various marbles. He believed they were more important to Western Europe. There were early 19th Century criticisms of taking the Elgin marbles, Edward Doddwell, painter and traveller said the Parthenon had been "despoiled" and that to get several metopes they had had to throw down cornices causing "shattered dissolution". He believed that it was appropriation by a strong over a weaker nation, that the Parthenon had escaped great damage until Elgin and that the Turks and Greeks lamented it. He also regretted the sight after Elgin comparing it to before the pieces were removed.[Channel 4, 'Lord Elgin and Some Stones of No Value] Indeed, there had also been concern at the time that the

pieces, which were lowered on ropes, may be smashed. Byron, too, disapproved, saying that what the Goth did not do, a Scot did.

Wyse also told the Select Committee on the British Museum that a Frenchman had been caught lashing out and damaging the Parthenon and some English travellers in 1820 saw Royal Naval midshipmen vandalizing the Caryatids.(D. Robertson, 1978, p.15) Damage was, therefore, by no means entirely restricted to the barbaric Turks and ignorant Greeks. In 1832, the *Penny Magazine* tried to promote civilised behaviour in its article on the British Museum. Artisans, it said, once having learned to enjoy exhibits:

Will naturally feel a pride in the possession by the Nation of many of the most valuable treasures of Art and Science; and they will hold that person a baby in mind - a spoiled, wilful, mischievous baby - who dares to attempt the slightest injury to the public property, which has been collected together, at an immense expense, for the public advantage,
[No. 2, April 7, p.14]

Various incidents, the most notable being the smashing of the Portland Vase, led to debates in Parliament about working class behaviour. It also led to more stringent legislation to protect museum property.

Damage and Legislation

There were some examples of damage to paintings and other items, in London museums, but they were not very common occurrences. The National Gallery had a police officer (in 1835 this was a Mr. Jupson, paid £1.4s a week) whose duty was "to see no improper persons find their way into the Galleries, and to assist the Porter in taking charge of umbrellas and

sticks.[Parliamentary Papers 1835. Appx.2. Returns relative to the National Gallery, Sept. 7, 1835, p.517] There were two happenings in 1844 which caused Eastlake some concern, (he had just been appointed in November 1843 as Keeper). The first was the visit by 300 boys from the Marylebone workhouse which went off well and the second was the damage of P.F. Mola's 'Jupiter and Leda' by "a crippled workingman." (D. Robertson, 1978, p.179-80) He had stood before it for some time and damaged it with his crutch. When arrested, he said it had been an accident while pointing something out to a friend, but he was fined £5 and unable to pay, given two months hard labour. Some people thought it was an act of moral indignation against the painting.

In 1841, [Parliamentary Papers, 1841, p.570] Mr. Grundy, Keeper of Pictures at Hampton Court, reported the general propriety of visitors. One painting on the stairs had been marked with a stick, a finger had been put through another painting "and the eye of Lord Darnley was picked out with a penknife." Generally, however, there was no trouble. Edward Hawkins, Keeper of Antiquities and Coins at the British Museum, reported the only irritation as the "constant habit that young people have of touching everything, which dirties some of the objects." [PP, 1841, p.612]

An incident in 1845 brought with it changes in the laws relating to the damage of art works and an indignation by some who believed such attacks were assaults on civilisation. On 8.12.'45 *The Times* headline ran: "Wilful Destruction of the Celebrated Portland Vase." William Loyd from Dublin, with only 9d in his pocket, had hurled a stone at the glass case containing the vase, valued at £1000, and both were broken. The motive was assumed to be 'notoriety' because although he confessed, Loyd would give no motive. He was fined £5 (for the vase and the case) or three

months hard labour, lessened later to £3 or two months hard labour. [*The Times* Wed. Feb. 12, p.7, col. 6] He was described as being 21, "of respectable appearance" and not deranged. His excuse was a "nervous excitement" due to a weeks heavy drinking just before and he said there was no malice intended. *The Times* however, complained that the Wilful Damage Act was defective and referred to the man who had damaged the painting at the National Gallery in 1844. A letter to the paper, (13.2.'45), from 'F.S.A.' called for public whippings for similar convictions for "Depend upon it other attempts will follow, either from love of mischief, or for a lodging of two months with food and fire. *The Times* reported that on February 14th a letter from an "anonymous Vandal" had sent the money to pay Loyd's fine and that Loyd left prison appearing very contrite. (He had however, been kept in solitary after hitting a prison officer.) The saga continued with *The Times* publishing an extract from *The Spectator* pleading for public prosecutions in such cases and describing the law in a way comparable to descriptions of Turks despoiling the Parthenon. It ran:

The other obsolete notions of rude and barbarous ages - such as the non-recognition of artistical value - still flourish in our law courts, Their maxims have preserved the form ... The thoughts and feelings of men whose minds differed almost as much from the minds of this generation as those of New Zealanders,
[17.2.'45, p.6, Col.2]

Art is thus given the power of civilising and it is savage not to recognise what they call "artistical value." Here it refers to the idea of the "priceless" work of art and the higher qualities of art. Yet the call for public prosecutions was motivated by a concern to get back adequate compensation in **monetary terms** if a work of art was damaged. The article

continues calling for a law "estimating works of art and historical monuments at their true value - the value they derive from the difficulty or impossibility of replacing them when destroyed."²⁷ Following the Portland Vase case, a bill was introduced "For the Protection of Property contained in Public Museums, Galleries, Cabinets, Libraries and other Public Repositories, from Malicious Injuries." [Parliamentary Papers XXV 1845, p.645ff] It recommended a maximum of two years punishment with or without hard labour and an option was granted to the judge to order a public whipping for between one and three occasions. A public museum was defined as all museums which admitted the public by charging or not and covered universities, colleges and hospital museums. Wilful damage was to be judged malicious damage and the offender could be arrested by anyone on the spot and taken to a J.P. The owner could resort to law for compensation against the offender. From April, amendments were made by committee; the title was now 'For the Better Protection of Works of Art and Scientific Collections ... ' The punishment was the same, but it now encompassed the prosecution of anyone who "tells, advises or pays for the offender." In July, the title was extended to include public statues and monuments (including churches) and the punishment reduced to six months. It became law on the same day as the Museums of Art Bill, (21.7.'45) and the reading spanned the same months, March to July. In the debate on the latter, Mr. Bernal referred to damage in the context of the behaviour of "the people" in terms of museums. Although, (or because), the vase incident occurred less than one month before, he says:

The one or two outrages which had been committed in public museums were not perpetrated by any of the labouring classes of the country. No operative, that he was aware of, had been convicted of an offence of this nature; but he believed the outrages which had been committed

were perpetrated by persons from a superior walk of life. [March 6, H.
p.387]

This, perhaps, is not strictly true, (1844, National Gallery), but is interesting in terms of the debate of working class behaviour and because the reassurances were deemed necessary. The Museums of Art Act, itself, contained the power to charge 1d for entry, to pay not only for the "preservation of contents", but also for the "maintenance of order." Questions of order and behaviour were closely allied to ideas about "the people's" access to museums and galleries. In the next section, we look at Select Committee reports which illustrate this debate and in which Sunday and evening opening of museums is discussed.

Access, Rights of Entry, Behaviour and Sunday Opening

Admission charges, ideas about status and class, behaviour and religious conviction are all included in the picture of 19th Century museum policy in England. When the British Museum first opened, it was for only three hours a day and later in the 1770's it was 9am-3pm Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday (May-August) and 4pm-8pm Monday and Friday, and 9am-3pm Monday to Friday (September-April). [*Parliamentary Papers*, 1772-4] To gain entry meant applying to the Porter some days before and filling "Name, Condition and place of abode" in a register[p.738] and stipulating the day and hour of the visit. It was up to the Librarian or Under-Librarian to decide "whether the persons so applying be proper to be admitted..." A ticket was issued at the Porter's Gate and sometimes took a while to come and a few visits to collect. Dr.

Maty of the Museum saw the visitors (who were allowed only two hours) as a problem and complained of the difficulties involved in administering the tickets. Would-be visitors kept coming back to pester and see if their tickets were ready. "He also did not like "Persons of different Ranks and Inclinations being admitted at the same time, and obstructing one another." He knew the officers felt that "some of the lower kind of People, in many Instances, behaved very improperly to them."(PP 1772-4 p739)

We have seen *The Penny Magazine's* rules laid down for artisans in museums in 1832 and the Select Committee on National Monuments and Works of Art(*Parliamentary Papers*, 1841, 439) (which included Slaney, Ewart and Hume) contains many references to the good behaviour of working class people. John Britton, witness and author of *British Cathedrals* was asked about the conduct of the people even in crowds "so great as to be denominated 'mob', but yet conducting themselves with decorum?" and he replied;

I have seen them in all instances orderly... I have seen them conduct themselves with strict propriety and with laudable curiosity, and to be moving on in their researches through the various rooms,"
(PP 1841, p443)

Sir Henry Ellis of the British Museum also stated that although 16,000-32,000 were let in a day "without any accident or mischief".[p.439] He thought this was the result of "The great experiment" of letting the public visit in the annual holidays and this liberal system for the past three or four years had seen no cases needing the interference of the police. He said the fears he voiced at the '35-'36 Select Committee about opening at Whitsun and Easter had not been realised. The museum had grown, rather, in popularity with the average visitor staying one to two

hours and others four to five hours. Visitor comfort was discussed and Ellis said the museum had provided more chairs. He was also questioned about the problems for visitors on days when thousands came and went in terms of public privies and we find that there were "one or two privies on the outside of the house, in the garden..."^{PP, 1841}[p.599] J.E. Grey, however, commented on the inconvenience caused by the lack of seating so that when a doctor is called to a fainting woman, "...I have found that the real cause of illness was the want of accommodation, and the best mode of cure to send them to an out-of-doors closet..."[PP 1841, p620)

The museum was now open longer hours 10am-5pm Monday, Wednesday and Friday in Winter and 10am-7pm in Summer with Tuesday and Thursday as days of "private admission". Although Ellis did not allow children under eight in except on private days, the Select Committee, who recommended the museums be more accessible, said that was likely to exclude people. The report also said children were allowed into Hampton Court and the National Gallery "without inconvenience".[PP 1841, p439)

The private days, when no more than 20-30 visitors were allowed was obviously an exclusive measure and Ellis had criteria for allowing admission on these days, for, he says, "I never refuse any party that comes if they are respectable, and make application, I immediately send them over."[p.603] The National Gallery, however, was, said the report, open to all "without distinction", from 10am-5pm Mon, Tues, Wed, Thurs in winter with Friday and Saturday for students and 10am-6pm in summer. Mr. Allen Cunningham, witness and author of *Lives of British Artists* supported the idea of greater access to works of art, saying that it made the public more careful of them. He added that the "question is solved by the National Gallery being opened, you see a great number of poor

mechanics there ... marvelling over those fine works, and having no other feeling but that of pleasure or astonishment; they have no notion of destroying them." [p.443] Again, although the discussion is about "The public" and "the people" it is made clear that they refer to "the poorer classes" or the working classes. Cunningham also refers to "the mob" which "ceases to become the mob when they get a taste." Thwaites Secretary at the National Gallery) is asked about the interest "the public" show in the pictures and his reply must have disappointed the Committee, for he said; "A consideration is shown by a few individuals, but I do not think that the mass of the people who attend, particularly on holidays, take any particular interest in them; they come and go without paying very much attention to the pictures." [Parl. Papers, 1841, p.581-2] He did, however, see questions being constantly put to the attendants.

The attendant, (since the beginning in 1824), Mr. John Peter Wildsmith, concurred with this last statement. He said that although he knew nothing of other paintings, he did know how much those in the National Gallery cost and those "considered the finest of the different masters, and that information I will give willingly to anybody who asks me a question; I feel a pleasure in telling them..." [p.584] ^{PP, 1841,} The attendants had no part in decisions about hanging the paintings but they help to lift them and although there had been no increase in their wages (2gns a week) they were now paid during holidays. According to Wildsmith the behaviour of the working classes was orderly and children were no trouble which was probably because the paintings were out of their reach. He gave a less pessimistic view than Thwaites about responses to the pictures. He had heard remarks that three-quarters of the paintings were "not good

enough", but he thought that "some of our worst pictures are most liked."

Murillo was the greatest favourite, but there had been some objections to Poussin's paintings for "some people think they are a little too broad*i.e.* vulgar; but they are very fine; and you scarcely know where to draw the line in works of art; some of the finest statues are objected to because they're naked." Interest was, however, growing and he noticed that mechanics appeared to go to the Gallery "in order to see the pictures and not to see the company." (This implies that other classes do go for the social scene and this was also the case in 1851.)

Sydney Smith, Canon of St. Paul's, did not have many good things to say about visitors. The prospect of free entry to St. Paul's alarmed him and he wanted to see the 2d for seeing the statues retained.²⁸ He was shocked that "the Cathedral [*is*] constantly and shamelessly polluted with ordure, the pews are sometimes turned into cabinets d'aisance and prayer books torn up; the monuments are scribbled all over, and often with PP 1841, grossest indecency." [p.474. Also quoted by Boase 1959, p.299] If he thought that free entry would worsen matters, then the Tower of London too had doubts that lowering the charges to 6d would cause trouble, "but the most satisfactory proofs of the error of these doubts have been afforded by the trial made. The behaviour of the public generally, had PP, 1841, given satisfaction to all parties." [p.440] The entrance figures and takings rose when the prices fell. Tours accompanied by a warden, took about one hour (and sometimes less), whereas at Hampton Court, the National Gallery and British Museum there was no set time in this way. The Committee reported also that some seating was provided (though one

witness complained that there were none - p.598) and that "no great inconvenience has been found to arise from that indulgence."

One witness in 1841, Mr. R.W. Buss, an artist, complained that visitors were rushed through so there was no time to see anything and that the catalogues were no use because if you stopped to read about an exhibit you lagged behind. He believed people should be allowed to come and go at will and also that more were now interested in antiquaries since "throughout most of the periodicals there is a tone of inquiry into those matters." [p.595-6] Ewart asked him if there was any need to generate the interest caused by the pictures and descriptions of ancient buildings in "cheap publications", and Buss said there was. The Chairman also asked Buss if a descriptive catalogue of the curiosities in the Tower would be a good idea and he replied:

Yes, I have had it in contemplation to do it myself, and I proposed it to Mr. Charles Knight; in fact, many of the drawings that I made for that purpose have been published in his "Penny Magazine" with a view to spreading this information more widely.
(PP, 1841, p596)

He complained, however, that permission for this was required from Shee the P.R.A. and that one needed to know "the right people" and prove respectability.. J.E. Grey, a later witness, also said the *Penny Magazine* exerted a good influence especially as they direct the public's attention to works of art. (PP, 1841, p620)

The Crown Jewels had also been made more accessible by lowering prices and this too had shown in the rising number of visitors. [See Appx.1, T1 It was reduced from three shillings to one and the Keeper now had a salary out of the fees.²⁹ Hampton Court's figures were also rising, (containing 29 rooms, it was open 5 days a week:

10am - 4pm Winter

10am - 6pm Summer

In 1839 it attracted 116,000 visitors. In 1840, 122,339)

It was also open on Sundays, at 2pm which was justified by the propriety of the visitors who were mostly working class. Writing in 1854, Waagen praises the improvements, since 1835, to make Hampton Court more attractive to the public for "the collection of pictures is far better placed and the arrangement with consecutive numbers most convenient." [Vol. 11, Letter XX1, p.354. See also an earlier description Passavant Vol. 1, p.77ff] There was also a guide book by then, giving a history of the Palace, famous people connected with it and some of "the most remarkable" paintings there. Visitor figures reached a peak in 1851 which was halved two years later, by the end of the decade they had begun to pick up again. [See Appx.1]

1841 was not only the year of National Monuments Select Committee, but also the year of the Fine Arts Commission when "the government took a further step in the organisation of art." [Boase, 1959, p.208] It was the result of a Select Committee's considering the promotion of the fine arts in connection with the rebuilding of the House of Commons. The President, as we have seen, was Prince Albert and the Secretary was Eastlake. Boase describes the latter appointment as "the first step in a career which was to lead to the presidency of the Royal Academy and the directorship of the National Gallery." [p.209] Both had been picked by Peel.³⁰ The competition for cartoons for frescoes resulted in an exhibition in Westminster Hall in 1843. They were fixed on screens covering the side walls and down the middle and packed together. It opened to a private viewing for Royalty and the Commission and for the first fortnight

admission was one shilling, attracting 1,800 a day. When admission was free it became very crowded, luckily, said *The Times* "with respectable people." [Boase, 1959, p.210] The first two weeks saw "the higher classes", who "flocked ... as to a fashionable resort, at a shilling a head," [Robertson, 1978, p.64] and Eastlake saw the crowds of the free weeks (mid-July-September) as proof that the "lower orders" appreciated pictures when given the chance.

Sundays and Evenings

Some politicians, reformers and Select Committee witnesses, supported the idea of Sundays and/or evenings for museum opening as it would give working class people greater chance to go. The history of Sunday observance shows a changing picture influenced by political, religious and economic developments. [See Wigley, 1980, p.6ff] The 17th and 18th Century Sundays were a mixture of the festal with its meat dinner and sober with Bible readings and various laws were passed to regularize Sunday observance. The Lord's Day Observance Society, (LDOS), was started in 1831 by a fundamental Evangelist, Daniel Wilson, who had friends in Parliament, originally through Sir Andrew Agnew, a right-wing Scottish M.P. Various attempts at reform were made in the early 1830's concentrating on fines for trading, drinking, gambling, baiting, pubs, wakes and fairs and even travel (except doctors and clerics). Evangelicals thought the State should enforce these ideas, but there was opposition - various radical M.P.'s, those opposed to State interference in work practices and *The Times*. The LDOS (with annual subs of 10/6d) was

predominantly made up of religious and professional middle classes, mostly Anglican (with some Methodists) and a few gentry and aristocrats. Wigley points out that, although they were against Sunday work, they defended the rights of the wealthy to use servants and their grounds, but wished to regulate the uses of rail and post. In 1855 the Sabbatarians warned servants that they "must not, under the pretence of keeping the Sabbath day holy, refuse to do any necessary work; such as making fires or beds." [Wigley, 1980, p.67. From Religious Tract Society's Tract No. 14 *The Lord's Day*]

That same year the radical M.P. for Leicester, Sir Joshua Walmsley, moved for a debate on the opening of the British Museum on Sunday. Mr. Pellat, (a Sabbatarian glass manufacturer said (to cheers) that as "someone who had mixed a great deal with the working classes", he thought "it was better to open them (museums) in the evening and Saturday afternoons especially as there was now a move for half-day Saturdays." [The Times March 21st 1855, p.7] Middle class audiences were told by Sabbatarians that they would be rewarded with God-given wealth but, in what appears to be yet another example of an attempt to mask the asymmetry of class relations:

When dealing with the working classes the Sabbatarians adopted a different approach producing tracts phrased in what they took to be the working class vernacular and picturing rural villages in which contented labourers observed a Sabbath eve, rose early on Sunday, went to church and then ate a frugal but satisfying meal of hot vegetables and bacon which had been largely prepared on the previous day. The working classes were enjoined to accept their poverty joyfully, to respect their employers and masters and to put aside all false ideas and ambitions.
[Wigley, 1980. p67)

In the 1855 debate, Lord Stanley said he recognised that intellectual and moral improvement was part of religion and integral to the Sabbatarianism argument. A worker was too tired, after work, to do much "self improvement", machines had not diminished human labour enough yet and he worked *harder* than before because competition dictated that his hours were not reduced. Sunday opening of museums would not, he said, deprive *churches* but *pubs* of customers. This was an opportunity to cure drunkenness without prohibitory laws for it was caused by "want of right intellectual occupation for the working classes." [*The Times* March 21st, 1855, p.7] Indeed, the Select Committee of the last session on public house licences advocated Sunday opening of museums. Stanley also accused the upper classes of hypocrisy when he said:

Did the Hon. Gentlemen mean to apply to themselves the same rules which they applied to working men? [cheers] If any gentleman would say that they passed the Sabbath in such a manner that they should regard it as a comparative profane occupation to visit a museum or to look at pictures, he would not dispute the question with them, [Hear, hear] ... there was a wide difference between doing that which we ourselves thought right, between obeying the dictates of our own consciences and endeavouring to force others to obey them, [Hear, hear,]

The vote was, however, lost by 187, (48 *for* 233 *against*). The second motion calling for Sunday opening of the British Museum also failed and Lord Shaftesbury, (now Chairman of LDOS), led a fight against the Crystal Palace opening on the Sabbath.[See J.L. & B. Hammond, 1945, (1923), p. 220] The Great Exhibition had been used in the argument for Sunday opening. Lord J. Walmsley said that it had had moral and religious influences on the lower classes. Among the visitors had been those who were sullen with suffering and so ignorant as "... to confound order with oppression, and wealth with injustice" and yet these men whose minds religious teaching

had not softened were "subdued at the grandeur of the sights which they there beheld and, for the first time, they learnt to reverence genius ..."[*The Times* 21st March 1855, p.7] The question of the Crystal Palace and the British Museum demonstrated that, although the LDOS ceased initiating legislation in the 1850's that they had "supremacy" over the two places.[Wigley, 1980, p.106-7] Thus there was no other vote on the British Museum and Sundays for another 20 years.³¹

Reformers like Ewart, were for widening access to museums including on Sundays and as a topic it came up regularly in select committees from the 1830's to the 1860's. Waagen [1835] supported a few hours Sunday opening for working people and in the 1845 Museums's Act debate Mr. Shiel said that "unless that arrangement were adopted, he did not think the measure would produce half the benefit which it might be made to confer." [H. March 6th 1845, p.394] In 1841 Ellis, (Superintendent of the British Museum) was against Sunday opening of his establishment as it would be profane and make it a mere place of amusement and "It would be only for people to look at statues and natural history." The Library (which he thought the most "useful" part of the Museum) would be shut and thus "On a Sunday it would be a mere show." [*Parliamentary Papers*, 1841, p.604] It was as though Sunday opening would change the very nature of the British Museum. It cannot be said, however strong Ellis' religious beliefs, that he welcomed working class people to the museum. In 1836 he said it was not his job to exclude "The vulgar class" [see Mordaunt-Crook, 1972, p.66] and only reluctantly opened for public holidays. Ellis said he was not against walking in the park on Sundays as it promoted good health but he said he was at a loss to state clearly why it was less immoral than visiting a museum on the Sabbath. [PP 1841, p.604] He was supported

by Edward Hawkins, keeper of Antiquities and Coins. J.E. Grey, keeper of Zoology, was for opening on Sunday afternoons for the people could go the church in the mornings.[p.618] Moreover, abroad, the Louvre, Palaces of Luxembourg, Versailles and Palais Royale were open on Sundays and the Museums in Antwerp and Munich.[p.616] In 1860, Ruskin (who did not draw on Sundays until in middle age and whose parents placed screens in front of the pictures for the 52 years he lived with them - Wigley 1980 , p.1) when asked whether he was aware that "a considerable number of the working classes are in bed on the Sunday?", replied, "Perhaps it's the best place for them."(*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860a, p.132)

The year before the 1860 Select Committee on evening opening there was a concerted effort by Mechanics' Institutes and other institutions to get these hours for visiting the Vernon and Turner Galleries (part of the National Gallery but moved to S. Kensington temporarily). The Society of Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce wrote to the trustees of the National Gallery on the subject, arguing that as museums were run at public expense, which was commendable, museums should justify this funding by making collections fully available to the public. Further, the evening opening at S. Kensington had proved that behaviour during this time was "irreproachable".(*Parliamentary Papers*, 1859, Sess. 2, Vol XV. "Copies of all Letters and Memorials addressed to the Committee of Council on Education or the Trustees of the National Gallery, with reference to the Admission of the Public in the Evenings to the Turner and Vernon Galleries of Pictures, and of Answers thereto." p.531) Numerous other organisations wrote similarly. (Including Dover Museum and Philosophical Institute, St Mary Islington Working Men's Institute, in union with the Society of Arts, Darlington Mechanics' Institution,

Yorkshire Union of Mechanics' Institutes James Hole and Kitson as Hon, Secs., Bolton Mechanics' Institute, Ebbw Vale Literary and Scientific Institution...) The letters expressed concern that museums lacked artificial lighting to cater for evening opening and the arguments were similar to many seen already in Parliament; greater access would check evil habits, improve "moral tone", improve "the comforts of society at large" and was part of a general social policy. One correspondent, the London YMCA said, "It's bearing upon those aspects of sanitary reform which are associated with the character and condition of the dwellings of the people is scarcely less important..."

Wornum's reply for the National Gallery, sent to all the groups who wrote, made it clear that, their collections, although at S. Kensington, were still subject to National Gallery rules and therefore there could be no evening opening. The Society of Arts wrote back threatening to petition parliament if necessary.

The ensuing negotiations are interesting and they show the National Gallery's proprietary feelings towards the collections at S. Kensington. Correspondence between Eastlake and the Chancellor of the Exchequer in December 1858 show the former's concern to stress that the Vernon and Turner paintings are only moved "for a time". He was also anxious to mingle other National Gallery paintings in with them (and this could ensure their eventual return). The tone of the letters suggest Eastlake is afraid the pictures will not be returned. [*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860^a XL, p.131, Letter 18.12.58.] The Chancellor was eager to reassure. Eastlake also tried to get a curator's residence at S. Kensington but Redgrave at the Science and Art Department told him that regulations "for police, preservation, watching and lighting must be the same as in the museum

itself." [24.12.58] Eastlake also wanted extra wall space but the Dept. appealed to him to be more moderate and the Treasury would support him. When the trustees met in the New Year, they emphasised that they wished to retain the "separate character of the National Gallery." [p.136] The Treasury told the Department of Science and Art to help the National Gallery to keep control and to arrange for the Gallery to have an office for catalogues at S. Kensington. The National Gallery, however, also wanted a separate entrance, but it was felt that the temporary building was too advanced when this was requested.³² The National Gallery was also not satisfied with the temporary building because they did not want their visitors to have to go through "a long line of miscellaneous exhibitions" and be "impeded by the general crowd." [p.140, 28.2.59 Letter to Lord Salisbury and The Treasury] The Treasury did not want to pay more for the extra entrance and told the trustees to sort it out with S. Kensington themselves. Eventually, however, a separate entrance was agreed to at a *small* cost, but the Treasury made it clear that practicality would demand that the two museums share cleaning and policing (although they could have their own attendants.) The National Gallery had tried very hard to maintain its "separateness" from S. Kensington, but gradually practicalities made it back down. By the end of November, in minutes sent to Cole at S. Kensington, the trustees agreed to open the building with their collections in it in the evenings *because* it was according to the regulations of S. Kensington. [p.147, Minutes, 30.11.59] They also allowed the student days to be the same as S. Kensington where, although the public paid 6d at the main entrance, students for the Vernon and Turner pictures could go free through the separate entrance.

In 1860, following on this and previous moves for evening opening, there was a Select Committee "to enquire whether it is *in the power of Parliament to provide* or of this house to recommend, further facilities for promoting the Healthful Recreation and Improvement of the People, by placing institutions supported by general taxation within reach of the greater section of the taxpayers, at hours, on weekdays, when, by the ordinary custom of trade, such persons are free from toil." [*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860^C] The report referred to a Society of Arts petition signed by 300 representatives of Mechanics' Institutes and pointed to the fact that S. Kensington had successfully opened during evenings so that the last three years had attracted some 3,000,000 evening visitors. It concluded that evening lectures and exhibitions were well attended by working men so that the British Museum, National Gallery and other such institutions should be open on week-day evenings. It recommended at least three evening openings of 7pm-10pm on days between Monday and Saturday as these "appear to be the most convenient days to the public at large." The idea of voluntary education and voluntary funding was still alive for the report also said that perhaps the public could pay to help with the cost of one of the evenings. Cole, during his evidence, said that evening opening was a "perfect success." (p.11)³³ The 6d days (during student days) kept S. Kensington quiet for "the ladies" but the behaviour in the evenings was described as "irreproachable". In three years only one person had been excluded and that was "for not being able to walk steadily." [p.12] Cole also added that the museum catered for the visitor by providing a refreshment room which also aided good conduct. Considering the museum/temperance equation, it is surprising to discover that S. Kensington served alcohol and in Cole's own words:

We were a little laughed at for opening a beer shop and that sort of thing, but the result has been perfectly satisfactory. During the last month of February, 45,350 persons visited the museum and to show how very little they indulged in what might be supposed to be injurious to them, there were only 20 bottles of wine drunk, 5½ bottles of brandy, 6 quart bottles of porter ... each person had upon the average, 2½ drops of wine, 16/25ths drops of brandy, 10½ drops of bottled ale, and so on.
[p,12]
(* Could be 6 - The print is indistinct in the Report)

There were no signs of intemperance and large amounts of tea and coffee were also served.

The question of greater access to museums unavoidably included discussions about work and leisure. The Rev. William Rogers described Charterhouse, where he worked in London, as a "desperate neighbourhood" with the houses like dog kennels. From here he had arranged trips to S. Kensington for the working class inhabitants. He believed that ½ day Saturdays were "a mischief to the working class" in their present condition for if it rained they went to the pub anyway. "They do nothing but play at skittles and spend their money in beer." [p.105] A trip to S. Kensington was expensive for them and they had to give Rogers 6d each for the fare of four miles. Although he said there was great interest he could not say if it was *enough* to cause moral improvement but he did not think evening opening was much good as many worked until 8pm.

Wornum, Secretary and Keeper at the National Gallery said that on festival days the Gallery was "almost inconveniently crowded" and that quite a few came on Mondays. [p.36] This could have been due to the continuing habit of St. Monday in "independent" trades. J. Kenny, a master printer, later said, "very frequently on a Monday, the working men like to take a holiday, and by doing a little work in the fore part of the

Sunday, they can play a portion of the Monday."[48] According to C.J. Witmore, printing machine manager, *Sunday* work was often a family affair in the tailoring business and he knew of one vicar kept waiting whilst the family cleared away their work upstairs. When he had asked his workmen about evening opening of museums, they had replied (not over-enthusiastically) "Open them, by all means." [p.65] John Lilwall, who had been with the Early Closing Association for 17 years, was all for evening opening to give the working classes a taste for museums. He believed they were better behaved if they had *more* leisure, and the pub was generally a resort from uncomfortable houses. The museum, however, could provide a sociable alternative to the pub and a place for families on Saturday afternoons. He also believed that Sunday working was sometimes *imposed* on the working classes, for example, when rich ladies gave dressmakers too short a time to make elaborate dresses.[pp.76-78]

Yet another witness, Robert M. Morell, a London Goldsmith, believed that greater interest was taken in museums by his profession than any other and he had supported the petition, five or six years back, for Sunday opening of public institutions. As it was, he and his workmates had to rush to the Mineral room at the British Museum in their dinner time and, he said, we "digested that for our dinner." [p.116] He believed that the desire to visit public institutions was due to the Great Exhibition which:

...turned the attention of the trade more to it than anything else, for many cases that contained articles which purported to be of English make had had the drawings for them made by foreigners, I have seen them come in one after the other, at a higher rate of wages than the rate paid to English workmen...

These foreign workmen had also told him and his fellow workers that "abroad at Vienna and so on, they are taught in Government schools by the best masters and... this instruction is given to them at a time when they can receive it." Witnesses were saying very similar things twenty five years before (at the 1835 Select Committee) and the Great Exhibition caused similar judgements to be expressed. Education in design needed to be more accessible.

For Morell, too, the crucial point is the lack of time a worker has, for, as he says, when a worker goes home he is not "prepared at once to go to the museum". He wants a good dinner and a wash. If he leaves work on a Saturday at 3pm he is not ready to go out until 4.30pm. He thinks strongly that Sunday is the best time but is not allowed to stress the point as it is not within the brief of the Committee. Evening, as a time for visiting museums, is no use, he says, because the man would go on his own and it should be a family visit and Saturdays were used for shopping and domestic chores.³⁴

At another Select Committee of the same year (*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860b on the arrangement of the British Museum's collection "and the best means of rendering them available for the promotion of Science and Art.") Henry Cole said he was for evening opening but the money for it did present problems.[p.401] It was discussed in terms of the cost of gas lighting and the effects this could have on the paintings. In 1859 Lord Salisbury appointed a commission (including Faraday) which conducted a test. Pigments were placed in seventeen locations in Britain including the National Gallery, British Museum, Bridgewater House, the House of Commons and "an unclosed water closet in the country ... in a privy in Surrey".[*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860a, p.13] The 'scientific gentlemen' later

reported that greatest injury was found in the National Gallery and said it was from bad ventilation³⁵ and the crowds who emitted "sulphuretted hydrogen" (wind) which discoloured the white paint. The next worse, but better than the National Gallery was the privy and the third worst was the House of Commons. (The British Museum was seventh) Gas lighting appeared to have nothing to do with the deterioration of pigment said the report but it would cost an average of £10 per evening (£12 15s with wages). Cole thought taxation did enough for the nation already and Panizzi said the trustees of the British Museum had objected to evening opening due to the cost and extra staff which added to the expense. The East India Museum too had no lighting facilities and would find the cost prohibitive. It was taken for granted that it was "the people" who needed to be educated to visit galleries and museums. It was also assumed that they needed to be educated *up* to the standards represented in such places as The National Gallery or British Museum. As we have seen, the *Penny Magazine*, for example, exhorted artisans to go to museums and to persevere against their prejudices. The belief in the civilising influence of the museum persisted and those politicians and select committee witnesses who believed in allowing greater access to working class people generally advocated Sunday and evening openings. Apart from a few witnesses at the 1860 select committee discussing evening opening, the problem was framed around the needs of male workers. In the next section we discuss not why working people tended to stay away from museums but rather how the upper and middle classes had greater access to collections, private and public. The experiences of two German 'experts', Waagen and Passavant, are focused on, as they not only write of their

experiences which span over three decades but also managed to gain access to the majority of collections of art in England.

Access to Private Collections

In *Outline of a Social Theory of Art Perception*, [1966] Bourdieu says that a cultural need is created by giving the means to satisfy it. He referred to works of art, and, as we saw above, Morrell the goldsmith referred to visits to the British Museum after going to the Great Exhibition. Although it was a struggle for him to visit, the British Museum was there and as a worker who saw himself above the average in status this was described as an important part of his trade and education. Bourdieu also discusses the unconscious appropriation of works of art that come to those who have a slow familiarisation with them. These could be among those who had paintings in their own daily environment, that of friends and were able to make numerous trips to art galleries. Many of the 19th Century connoisseurs were one or more of the following artists, politicians, collectors and the wealthy. All had varying degrees of access not only to public but also to private collections in England.

John Silk Buckingham said that one of the most important assets for a traveller was a letter of introduction. It was also proof of respectability and in his case, his colonial connections were also useful. Eastlake was welcomed by Waagen in Berlin and in 1849 he married Elizabeth Rigby (who translated both Passavant and Waagen's works on English art) and she:

Moved eagerly, with high spirits and lively interest, into the world of artists and writers, scientists and travellers, university dons and dignitaries of the Church - the world also of great collectors, eminent statesmen, intelligent peers, and that hard-working Royal couple, the Queen and the Prince Consort.
[D. Robertson, 1978, p.107]

The Eastlakes' social life included dinners with the Cockerells, Lady Chantrey, the Peels, private viewings and discussions about art with Sir Robert Peel and going to Christies with Samuel Rogers.¹⁵ In her Journal, Lady Eastlake recorded that Lord Ward gave her and her husband "carte blanche of entrance, which is a privilege, as the public are not to be admitted yet. He has a most remarkable Raphael." [23.5.49] Otto Mundler, travelling agent for the National Gallery in the 1850's, had been known to Eastlake as a dealer he had done business with in 1845 and known for his criticism of the lack of art-historical progression in the Louvre's catalogue. Agent's connections with other agents' helped Mundler gain access to the home of the Duca Melzi to negotiate for a Perigino, [D. Robertson, 1978, p.153] which the National Gallery bought for £3000.

It was quite often very difficult to get in to see private collections. As Boase says, "armies of servants expected handsome gratuities from the visitors, who here hurried through heavily curtained rooms with neither time nor light for seeing anything." [p.278] Passavant's experiences bears this out. In an interesting encounter which shows how the German visitors had to adjust behaviour in order to gain entrance to a collection, (perhaps it is an example of what Elias asserts as the class differences in England and Germany which gave rise to differences in what was seen as civilised behaviour, that is, that the German middle

classes did not have, to the same degree, the aristocratic aspirations as did the the English], Passavant (1978), says,

It was at Bowood that we were first initiated into the insolence of the English race of menservants. We had entered the portico, and my friend so far forgot himself, or rather so far remembered his German good manners, as to take off his hat, and address himself in a friendly tone to the servant. By this civility, he, however, forfeited all claim to respect in the fellow's eyes, who answered very saucily, and desired us to go to the back door. Fortunately, I was better versed in English usages, and coming up with a lofty air, and my hat on my head, said in the appropriate drawl, "Where's the housekeeper? I have a note from the Marchioness." This altered his tone immediately and we were properly admitted.

[Passavant, Vol.1, p.310]

(Elizabeth Rigby, as translator, adds an ironic footnote to this account; "To those acquainted with the excellent arrangement of Lord Lansdowne's household, nothing less than the assertion of a German would entitle the anecdote to belief.")

Passavant immediately launches into another anecdote:

As a further instance of the insufferable airs of this class in England ... a nobleman of the highest rank (an English Duke), on visiting the collection of the Duke of Sutherland, put a crown into the servant's hand; "My Lord," said the man, eyeing the piece with infinite contempt, "from such noblemen as yourself, I am accustomed to receive gold." The Duke pocketed the crown again, adding, "tell your master, that you'll get neither gold nor silver from me." (1978 pp.310-311)

When Waagen visited many English collections in the 1850's for his book of 1854, he too encountered some problems. In the waiting room of Sir Anthony Rothschild, he mentions two paintings, one a Van Dyck, but that "for some domestic reasons I was hurried from this apartment before I had gained sufficient ... insight into its contents, of which, therefore, I can say but little ... "[Vol.11, p.281] Another impediment he mentions is lack of time and opportunity to re-visit collections.[Vol.11, pp.340-341] He visited Mr. Labouchere's collection in London and also at Stoke near Windsor. The latter was "in Italian style of architecture" and contained

modern sculpture; statues by Waagen's "lamented friend Thorwaldsen" and Canova. His paintings here were mainly Italian and Dutch. He had an "early" Italian Gentile da Fabriano which Waagen regrets was "hung too high to enable me to form an opinion."¹⁸⁵⁴[Vol.11, pp.17-423] Waagen had noticed that from the time of his first survey in 1835, that all the various collections had been increased, many "from the epoch of Raphael" but that some included earlier works from Italy, Germany and the Netherlands. These were such as Labouchere and Lords Ward and Elcho.

It was in 1850 when Labouchere (who as an M.P. supported museum legislation) showed Waagen round his Windsor collection. They lunched and the tour afterwards, said Waagen, "gave me the opportunity of fitly estimating his great enjoyment and refined knowledge of the works of art under his roof."[p.417] Labouchere's collection, said Waagen, was testimony to his "distinguished qualities" and taste. Art appreciation and social events often mixed and art was sometimes the *cause* of entertaining. At a dinner in June, 1851, given by Labouchere, Waagen met "... Lords' Granville, De Mauley, and Overstone, Mr. Thomas Baring, Sir Charles Eastlake and Mr. Charles Dupin, [and] I observed other objects of art which appeared to me well worthy of closer examination."[Vol.11, p.287] He could not, however, "take advantage of Mr. Labouchere's kind permission to inspect them" as he lacked the time. (He was then a judge for the Great Exhibition.)²⁶

Difficulties encountered in viewing paintings were often due to the way they were hung, the lighting etc. At Windsor Castle in 1850, Waagen had "the favour" of Prince Albert which "insured me the necessary liberty." However, "the placing of hot air tubes in the chief apartments, then going on, had led to the removal of the pictures", and a fresh

permission was needed to allow him to see the drawings and engravings. In 1851 when he returned for this with the same "powerful recommendation", the day was so dark and rainy that his view was impaired. (1854, Vol II, p423)

Both Passavant and Waagen visited the Dulwich Gallery.³⁷ Some galleries still demanded tickets - and for entry to Dulwich you had to get cards from "Messers Ackerman, Colnaghi, and most artists of 1854 note." (Passavant, Vol.1, p.61) Tickets were free, Waagen, (Vol.11, p.341) too notes the method of access as obtaining a ticket from Messers Colnaghi, (others, for which tickets were necessary, included the museum of John Soane - Passavant 1978 Vol.1, pp.259-262. The John Hunter museum at the Royal College of Surgeons needed "an order from any member of the society.") Waagen, in his Preface, thanked Passavant and other writers for the help they had given him and also "the superintendents of the different public galleries [who] assisted me in various ways with their knowledge, and the proprietors of private collections afforded me the freest admittance." (vi) Indeed, Waagen had gained access through contacts, social and political and letters of introduction. Here are two examples. He got in to see the collection of a Mr. Bicknell (who made his money from whale fishing and, like Vernon and Sheepshanks, collected contemporary English painting) and he says, "I was indebted to my friend David Roberts, the painter, for an introduction to Mr. Bicknell who resides at a pleasant country seat a mile from Dulwich." (Vol.11, p.349) 1854 Another was the collection at Stafford House - "Being furnished with two letters from the Queen of Hanover and the Princess Louisa of Prussia, I waited upon the Duke of Sutherland, I was received in the kindest manner, and the Duke himself, showed me the principal parts of the house."³⁸

Passavant's text, too, is peppered with such phrases as "Being furnished with the necessary card of admission (1978Vol.1, p.223] He had started out as an artist travelling to Italy and France. While in Paris he copied in the Louvre and was especially fond of Raphael. Indeed, he had friends to help him gain access for "if he came to the gallery and found it closed, he would enlist the help of Alexander von Humboldt or August von Schlegel to have it re-opened, so that he could continue to make copies of the paintings by his favourite artist."(Passavant, Introduction 1978 ix] (Humboldt (1769-1859) was a German scientist and traveller who lived in Paris during the 1820's. Schlegel, (1772-1829) literary critic and historian.)

He stayed in Italy for seven years studying art including the artists from before Raphael which his circle of German artists were interested in. He went out sketching with them and became recognised as an art critic and was also a semi-official agent for the Stäedelsches Kunst institute in Frankfurt. He came to Britain in 1831 having decided to write on Raphael. His book on the artist came out in 1839 and was described as a "new departure in the study of art-history,"[p.xxii] as it offered a catalogue raisonné, an analysis of stylistic development and lists of Raphael's drawings all of which he had seen. Here for one year he had to finance himself so he took notes of collections he saw and between February and December 1832, he wrote his book on English art collections. Elizabeth Rigby, in her Translator's Preface, called him "one of the first connoisseurs of the day" and noted his thorough research and thorough knowledge.[Passavant, p.xvii] Like Waagen, he complains of lack of time and some of the treasures barred to him. The drawings of Sir Thomas Lawrence, (late PRA), of whom Waagen says that he spent £4,000 on

drawings [Vol.1, p.28] which included ones by Michelangelo, Leonardi da Vinci, which were refused to Passavant. He was only allowed to see the Raphael. Passavant described the collections as an "usually absolutely inaccessible treasure" for which he gained "partial admission."

He was given the "favour of making a particular catalogue of them ... " but of the rest, despite, "the strongest recommendations, and the most unremitting exertions on my own part, [it was] impossible for me to procure a sight." (Woodburn had exerted influence for him.) No reason was given except to say it was the wish of the executors. Passavant, however, said:

It appeared that being desirous of fulfilling the purport of the late President's will which directed this collection to be disposed of to some public English institution and thus secured a whole to the country, it was feared lest any prior exhibition, by placing them beneath the eyes of the ignorant and indiscriminating, might prove prejudicial to the sale. They therefore came to the determination of secluding them impartially from all, thus offering neither favour nor offence to any one.

(1978, Vol.I, p236)

Mr. Woodburn bought them but the Government would not buy. Eastlake, in 1840, tried to get the trustees of the National Gallery to buy the drawings.(See . Robertson, 1978, p52)

Other collections which presented no difficulties at all to Passavant and Waagen were also thrown open to the public during May and June; the Bridgewater, Stafford and Marquis of Westminster's Galleries "thus setting an example of liberality to the country which it is hoped will not remain without imitation."(Passavant,1978, Vol.I, p148)

Sometimes, some introductions were incorrect - Passavant was introduced to Mr. Roscoe, (owner of some Raphaels), through an Italian translator of one of Roscoe's books, only to find that Roscoe had never

heard of the Italian. (The Italian had, however, met Roscoe's *son*. Passavant, 1978, Vol.II, pp12-13)

Access to private collections was generally afforded to those with the right credentials and connections. Working class people did not have the time, social acceptability or the inclination to try to gain access to them. The asymmetry of the relations between the classes is reflected here. Middle and upper class men could go slumming to the music halls and have music hall stars at their soirees. They could arrange, organise and supervise exhibitions for the working man, but the working class person at Christie's during the day, (or any other time, unless employed there), was presumably a rare sight. Although there were some working class areas where the upper classes would not have been entirely welcome, this does not create an equal situation, politically or economically.

Art-History, Experts and Purchasing Policies.

In the Preface to his *Art Treasures of Great Britain*, Waagen says his aim is to "diffuse a pure and real feeling for art in England." He hopes it will be a practical guide for "those cultivated classes from all parts of England who visit the galleries of London during the season ... " and thus he first describes the collections in and near London and then the near counties accessible by rail. He says he wants to make private collections accessible to the "cultivated" and attractive to tourists. His work was read by those like Eastlake (and there were even rumours that Prince Albert advocated his appointment as Director of the National Gallery Robertson1978p.136). Considered an expert in the field, he was

not directly employed by the State as yet, but as expert he lent weight to certain policy positions in Select Committees, for museums and Schools of Design. He was a friend of many who were in Government, of painters and museum personnel and aristocrats. Corrigan would place him as an aid to the dominant morality. Eastlake, artist, expert, and Government servant, had a more direct impact on the National Gallery itself, through purchasing policies, art-historical studies and arrangements of pictures expressing views similar to other museum functionaries.

Richard Johnson discusses 'the expert' in terms of the growth of the State. [Donadjgrodzki, 1977, p.77] This expert emerged in the 1830's and has a "kind of composite biography." That is, a Poor Law Commissioner or a member of the middle class with commercial origins who may well have been engaged in a statistical enquiry. These men of formal politics also sat on select committees on education and so forth. (Johnson does, however, identify two "generations", e.g. the older one of Chadwick and Senior and a younger set of Wyse and his like.) Ewart, Wyse, Slaney and Roebuck etc., spoke up in Parliament to support local museums and libraries and they sat on select committees on art and industry, national museums and Sunday evening opening. As Boase says, the Select Committees on Art and Manufacture (1835 and 1836) "represented the reformers of 1832 and the avowed indifference of Lord Melbourne." [Boase, 1959, p205]

The growth of the education department began in a pragmatic way alongside a system of private control by voluntary agencies. (see R. Johnson in Donadjgrodzki, 1977). The very early beginning of government involvement with the British Museum expressed faith in public funding - but only by a lottery. Later government granted money for building and purchases. In 1824 the National Gallery was created by government

purchase and it and the British Museum were accepted as government responsibilities and indeed, the Treasury could block or encourage purchases.³⁸ Local funding for local museums, however, in the various bills, presented problems and indeed the idea was met with a horrified reaction by many M.P.'s on the issue of taxation. The voluntary principle went further when local museums were discussed, not only would they be furnished by donations but they were also seen by many (including mainly supporters of local museums) as repositories of minor works of the national institutions and of any duplicates that the latter may have. In 1860 this was still being expressed.[*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860b] The Select Committee on evening opening [*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860c] stated that surplus works and duplicates should be loaned in the same way as had been successful with the government Schools of Design throughout the country.[p.4] This would stop the national collections being "so vast as to bewilder" and being "entombed". There was, therefore, an element of sharing London's riches with the working class in other places but also the emphasis on duplicates and "surplus" smacks of loaning out the second best. As Ruskin said, he was in favour of greater access for the working class (in the evenings and as an alternative to the ale-house) but fearing fire, it would be best to show them collections that were simple and cheap.[p.129] It was the idea of private control and contribution to museums that created many of the rules about the adoption of the various acts allowing rates to be levied for local museums.

Whereas Johnson's main emphasis is on "formal" politicians ("Since to be effective, experts had to force a passage into formal politics, we must start with the politicians." Donadjgrodzki, 1977, p.81), there is also a type of expert who had strong links with politicians and in many ways

represents them, is chosen by them and to which is delegated tasks which create a practical embodiment of shared ideas. The social circles of such experts is also important and they include many whom Steegman says were influential at the time but who are no longer familiar.[1971, p.180] These included women like Elizabeth Eastlake and Anna Jamieson and others who were writers and intellectuals. The social scene provided points of contact for discussion, gauging opinion and contriving to be "cultivated". This "civilised" society could admire and respect both those who made money and those who were "eminent intellectuals". The Royal Institution (Steegman, 1971, p.71) attracted "fashionable and cultivated society ... in evening dress." p.71 Steegman portrays Lady Eastlake as typical of an upper middle class which earns money and contrives "to keep one foot in the intellectual, and the other in the fashionable camp..." As we have seen, the meeting points included exhibitions, galleries and museums.

It was possible for experts to become known as such through the way in which they made money. William Seguer (1771-1843), before becoming keeper at the National Gallery had been an agent, restorer and professional expert employed by great collectors, for example, Peel, George IV and Wellington. (The connection between attribution and money is a close one - as we saw when Passavant wanted to inspect the Lawrence collection.) As first keeper at the National Gallery "he enjoyed full scope (Steegman, 1971, p.47) in all his capacities." p.47] Passavant tells the story of how when the National Gallery was first set up and the Angerstein collection was bought that three Correggio's were "undoubted copies". One, 'Christ on the Mount of Olives', was first brought to England by an Italian who took it to Mr. Cosway "the academician, then in high repute as a connoisseur" who was asked if 200 guineas was a fair price, to which Mr. Cosway replied:

"My good sir ... if you wish to condemn the picture at once, you cannot adopt a surer means than by asking so small a price; but if, as you aver, the picture is an original, my advice is that you make the hundreds thousands, and ask no less than two thousand guineas."

(Passavant, 1978, Vol.I, pp24-25)

It was taken to Angerstein who referred it to Benjamin West and Sir Thomas Lawrence who usually helped him "with their knowledge" and who "decided in its favour, and the cunning dealer obtained his money."

When the National Gallery was very first set up it was offered a Correggio from the Escorial for 1200 guineas "but former experience had rendered them rather shy of investing the public money in pictures, and it was impossible to convince them that the one now offered was an original." Thus it was sent to France but later found its way back to London to the picture dealer Neuwenhuys, who sold it to the National Gallery for £3,000 "which was certainly paying rather dear for their experience." Passavant therefore thought it fortunate that Seguer became keeper for he was "a gentleman, whose perfect discrimination in pictures, and long-tried probity, render the recurrence of such fatal mistakes almost impossible." His hands are tied, however, as far as purchasing goes for he needs the "express consent of Parliament". (1978, Vol I p26)

William Young Ottley was another dealer considered an expert (especially in drawings) and he is often cited by Waagen as an authority. Steegman describes how he was "accepted as a leading authority on taste" and how his writing (including a four volume book of engravings of the Stafford Gallery - cost 12 guineas - Passavant, 1978, Vol I p136) was influential in "informing scholarly taste." (Steegman p.60) He became keeper of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum. Waagen talks of him

and Samuel Woodborn in the same breath as men who gave England lasting benefits as they managed to transplant "the most admirable works of art into their country." (Waagen, Vol I, p26)

Eastlake too had expert status. He had been picked out by Peel in 1841 and thereon his career led him to the Directorship of the National Gallery. The Scholar/Connoisseur role soon overtook his painting so that "The result was that Eastlake became at once, and remained for the rest of his life, the recognised *expert*." (Steegman, p.65] He was also on the Council of the Government School of Design and by the 1840's "...everyone who wanted either to sell or to buy a picture consulted him, whether they had a claim on his time or not." (Steegman, 1971, p.194] At one point Eastlake was secretary to the Fine Arts Commission, being pushed to put himself forward as Secretary to the R.A. (which he did not) and was also keeper at the National Gallery (1843). Robertson says that "Eastlake felt harassed, with a sardonic laugh, he complained that everyone seemed to take him as the only expert who could advise on a picture for sale, or superintend a school of design, or manage a collection as curator." (Robertson, 1978, p.76] (In fact he employed a friend to help him with the Commission's work.)

Similar to most of those who were considered experts, Eastlake collected paintings. Waagen notes how he had, "a rich and choice library of books and engravings, illustrative of the history of art from the middle ages to the present time, in which the connoisseur in such literature will find rarities often sought in vain in the largest libraries." [Vol. II, p.263] He only possesses "a few pictures by the old masters, more or less remarkable." They included Rembrandt, Van Dyck,

Bellini, Tintoretto, Veronese, Poussin and an unfinished Lawrence (13 in all).

Although those considered major art authorities generally placed Raphael as the standard to judge others or the height of perfection, art-historical study was becoming much more systematic than before. And this affected purchasing and arrangement of paintings in the National Gallery. (1978, Passavant called Raphael "divine" Vol. I, p.235] but art history was being expanded to the study of so-called 'primitives' or pre-Raphaelite works.³³ Thus, "By the time of the Art Treasures Exhibition at Manchester in 1857 the 16th and 17th century heroes of the age of Reynolds no longer held unquestionable authority in the public eye, though Raphael himself was still turned to as the touchstone..."[Leicester Museum and Art Gallery: 'The Victorian vision of Italy', 1968, p.8] Between 1800 and 1850 there were seventeen books written about him and Prince Albert began one in 1853. It was Prince Albert, however, who was seen as an early collector of "Early" Italian paintings "and much is due to Eastlake's activity in the 50's and 60's as Director of the National Gallery that the Nation is so rich in works of the earlier Italian schools." Prince Albert's collection included early Flemish and the Italian "primitives" of Duccio, Fra Angelico and Gentile da Fabriano "which hardly anyone else at that time would have dreamt of buying." [Leics. Museum, 1968, p.60] These went to the National Gallery after his death. Eastlake, for the National Gallery, and Prince Albert both used the same agent in Italy - Gruner.

Art historians were "discovering" artists in Italy and drawing a "map" slotting artists in. In the 1850's, for example, "Raphael was a newly realised Master and the critics were still uncertain where to place him." [p.239] Lady Eastlake was saying he was worthy to be placed between

Giotto and Michelangelo. In 1864 two art historians, Crowe and Cavalcaselle, produced two volumes of *A New History of Painting in Italy*. They had already published *The Early Flemish Painters*, by Murray in 1856, see Robertson, 1978, p.185) This was part of an attempt to produce a "codex" as the basis of research and they had worked from recent research in Italian archives and from personal inspection. Lady Eastlake in 1862 approved the manuscript before it was printed. The first two volumes were dedicated to her husband and the third to Layard. Layard, described by Steegman as close friend and adviser to Eastlake, and whom we saw as a donor of Assyrian works to the British Museum, did not, however, agree whole-heartedly with this type of connoisseurship, complaining it lacked flair and imagination.[Steegman, 1971, p.243] Like Passavant and Waagen, Crowe and Cavalcaselle had begun research by visiting private collections (eg., the Duke of Devonshire's of which Waagen said "the Italian school predominates." Vol II, p.90) The greater interest shown in "early" Italian art can be gauged, says Steegman, by the big profit that was beginning to be made from faking them.[Steegman, 1971, p.244] There was still some resistance to it with "barbaric" and "primitive" used frequently to describe artists like Cimabue and Taddeo Gaddi. (The Arundel Society was, however, formed in 1848 to record and promote "early" paintings using chromolithographs and both Ruskin and Samuel Rogers supported it.)

The Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857 had works donated for the occasion by collectors which included 13th and 14th century Italian and (1971), "early" Flemish. Steegman, says the aim was to improve taste, education and thereby, industry.[p.236] When the Mayor of Birmingham wrote to the Staffordshire Advertiser in March 1857 about the proposed exhibition in

May he said that it would not interfere with their exhibition of manufactures planned for that Autumn in Birmingham. This was because the aims of each were so different but "The former may produce a beneficial effect on the latter by attracting a considerable number of foreign visitors to England..."[*Staffordshire Advertiser*, Mar 7, 1857] At the opening ceremony of the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition Prince Albert thanked the rich for placing their treasures before "those whom fortune has denied the higher luxuries of life" and for "bringing forth from the innermost recesses of their private dwellings their choicest and most cherished treasure..."[*Staffordshire Advertiser*, May 9, 1857] (On the dais with him at the inauguration was a pedestal with a Sevres vase on it which had been presented to Albert as commemorative of the 1851 Exhibition. The building was also described with transepts etc like the Crystal Palace) His speech made it clear that the aim was educational and therefore everything had an "historical arrangement." Like 1851, it was comparative, for he said:

If art is the purest expression of the state of mental and religious culture and of general civilisation of any age or people, an historical and chronological review ... cannot fail to impress us with a just appreciation of peculiar characters of the different periods and countries ... and of the influence which they have exerted upon each other,

Referring to the "older schools" Prince Albert said they should make "us" proud of the great development of knowledge and humble when we considered their "refinement of feeling." The *Manchester Guardian* ran a series about the exhibition - "Peeps at its progress" - before it opened and regular articles on the different schools thereafter, in one printing a long list of "important" Italian painters. There were sections; Ancient

Masters, Oriental art, Ornamental art etc and a 3 volume catalogue by Waagen. There were letters in the paper asking about what dress to wear for the opening ("which will be most au fait, morning or evening dress?" ran one. The editor replied - "Morning dress, certainly." - Apr 28, 1857, 4) There were also advertisements in the *Manchester Guardian* for the music for Art Treasure Waltzes, polkas and hats for promenading. On the opening day huge crowds were reported with many shops being shut and later, that the largest numbers were recorded when it was raining [May 28, 31. "Distinguished visitors", like Kay-Shuttleworth were reported (16 May - he visited the day before) and that country folk and workers went. Two hundred from a Salford firm were seen "strolling around evidently enjoying even the old masters." [May 28, 1957, 31

Just as Prince Albert referred to "early" Italian art's refinement of feeling, Waagen too, three years before, had attributed the growing interest in it to "its purity and religious depth of feeling." [Vol II, p.461] They saw it as primitive but sincere. One collector of 13th-15th century art, the Reverend John Fuller Russell gave it "high significance" in terms of "ecclesiastic art", but it was also becoming acceptable and increasing in price.

We have mentioned the close links between attribution and value of paintings and a connoisseur's reputation rested on his being reliable. Eastlake had this reputation which gave him power over dealers, salesrooms and journals. Waagen's concern about this "reliability" is shown in his defence of his doubts about Lord Ashburton's Leonardo da Vinci (based on the forms being "too indefinitely round", the hands too feeble, the dark heavy colouring etc). A Mr. John Smith (author of a catalogue of Dutch, Flemish and French schools) had accused him of

attributing to another artist, which Waagen insists "never entered my head." Thus, he says, "It was satisfactory to me ... to find that two such connoisseurs as Sir Charles Eastlake and M. Passavant, on the occasion of a visit to the collection in 1850, entirely shared my opinion, and expressed as much to Lord Ashburton in my presence." [Vol II, pp.98-99] Lady Eastlake, too, wrote in 1850, that her husband rarely quitted a collection without "clearing up some doubtful masters for the owners ... I find his worth is unfailingly recognised..." [cited in Steegman, 1971, p.199] Interestingly, Passavant mentions a Mr. John Smith in an anecdote. He refers to Smith's book on "Netherlandish artists and their productions which is published at a guinea a volume," [Vol 1, 1978, p.255] in which Smith priced each painting. Passavant, however, was more sceptical of this saying that Smith, a picture dealer, could hardly be expected to be impartial when his "credit with his wealthy amateur patrons is at stake." This led to:

...the frequent substitution of copies for originals ... How little these inaccuracies are to be ascribed to ignorance of the subject, the following anecdote will prove. A picture by Van Dyck, according to Mr. Smith's work, worth a large sum of money, was lately put up to auction. Being, however, universally acknowledged for a copy, no-one would bid. Mr. Smith himself, who was present, was equally remiss, to the infinite amusement of his picture dealing brethren, who kept good-humouredly taunting him, with "Now, Smith, why don't you bid? You who, above all, know the real value of the picture; don't disgrace your own valuation!" but good Mr. Smith was immovable, and the picture remained unsold.

1971,

Graña describes the preoccupation with originals (which may be related, he says, to the Western tradition of primogeniture or "the first born") as necessary to the existence of the art market and museums.⁴¹

The connoisseur could make use of his knowledge, for as Lady Eastlake abroad wrote to her mother in 1855, her husband; "Last year ...

made acquaintances which now serve his purpose. Most of the owners are needy and in debt, glad to have good prices for things which in their opinion any modern daub will replace." [Cited in Steegman, p.199] When they returned from that trip Eastlake was appointed Director of the National Gallery at £1,000 p.a. In the next section we see how the ideas of experts could influence purchases and arrangement of exhibits. The idea of Western supremacy in art and civilisation is also revealed and there is a discussion about Ethnography at the British Museum.

The arranging of exhibits and ideas of progress at the National Gallery and British Museum.

Between 1824 and 1840 £103,260 was spent on paintings for the National Gallery (£60,000 of this went for the Angerstein collection and £3,000 to help defray "incidental expenses". Passavant, Vol 1, p.23) In 1826 the government granted various amounts for various purchases (see *Parliamentary Papers*, 1841, p.626, Appx II) The Angerstein paintings included Sebastiano del Piombo, Claude, Titian, Caracci, Raphael, Correggio, Poussin, Rubens, Rembrandt, Van Dyck, Reynolds, Vélasquez, Hogarth and Wilkie. [p.628, see also Robertson, 1978, pp.292ff for acquisitions 1824-1854] In 1826 George Beaumont gave 16 paintings, in 1831 the Reverend Holwell Carr bequest gave 35 and many other gifts followed. The purchases show many of the 'usual'; Murillo, Guido Reni, Raphael, Rubens, Carracci etc. In 1842, however, it bought what Robertson describes as its first 'primitive', Jan Van Eyck's 'Jan Arnolfini and his wife' when Segulier offered its owner £630 for it. It was praised by both

Passavant and Waagen. The latter marvels at the apparently 'advanced' technique for "the picture also presents a fine general effect and a deep and rich chiaroscuro, which is the more remarkable considering the 1854, period." [Waagen, Vol 1, pp.348-349] Between 1848 and 1850 the Gallery bought nothing but was donated two Italian 'primitives' _ a Taddeo Gaddi and a Lorenzo Monaco. Waagen doubted the Taddeo Gaddi attribution because he felt it was not sufficiently "able" and as he said "I have never seen such mechanically painted beards in any of the indubitable works by that (1854, master..." Vol I, p.318] So, it was 'primitive', even by 'primitive' standards. By 1855 the Gallery had 503 paintings and under Eastlake's Directorship (1855-1865) bought a Botticelli and a Benozzo Gozzoli, and, in 1857, a purchase of over £7,000 from an Italian collection and including Cimabue, Duccio, Fra Angelico, Filippo Lippi, Uccello and Piero della Francesca. [See Robertson, 1978, p.305 and pp.124-125. Also PP 1860, p.100] He was also able to sell off some unwanted paintings.

At the 1841 Select Committee Thwaites gave an insight into how paintings were then purchased. If time was not pressing, he said, "and the merits of the picture require to be well ascertained they call in the assistance of artists and amateurs, who give written opinion. [p.581] Segurier also could report verbally to the trustees but when two Correggio's were to be bought in 1834 they were very expensive; therefore, written opinions were given. (The purchase could have been vetoed by the Treasury.) Letters were submitted to the trustees saying the paintings, then in the hands of Samuel Woodburn, were worth £10-12,000. Wilkie, the artist, commented on the artistic merit and rarity of the works but would not put a price tag on them. He is, however, keen to vouch for their authenticity;

They are undoubtedly originals by this great painter ... and whether to interest the public in the higher purposes of art, or to guide the taste of the student, would to the gallery now forming be a most desirable acquisition... (PP 1841, p.631 - *1834 was the year the National Gallery moved to Trafalgar Square)

Otterly, Seguer, artist Richard Westall Hilton and the picture dealer William Buchanan wrote to say they were worth £12,000. Thwaites described this as the trustees entrusting "their opinion of the value of the pictures by reference to several artists and amateurs." (PP 1841, p.583) (And, he said, it was the only time written opinions were given.) Quite often the trustees used their own judgements (see Robertson 1978, p.294 and p.92 for criticisms of purchases by Verax) when the paintings were well known and they felt confident. In 1841, despite reassurances from such as Buchanan, the Treasury refused the money for Vélasquez' 'The Boar Hunt'. Five years later, however, Peel instructed Charles Baring Wall MP to make an offer for it, he told the trustees as well and the Treasury agreed to the £2,100 asking price. (It was in fact bought for £2,200. See Robertson, 1978, p.92) The 1852-3 Select Committee on the National Gallery which included Labouchere and Goulbourn voted on a proposal to give discretionary powers to the Director to buy paintings without reporting it to the Committee, which was defeated by the Chairman's vote. Those for were Lord Elcho, Mr. Vernon, Mr. Harrison and Lord W. Graham, and those against were Lord Seymour, Mr. Ewart, Mr. B. Wall and Sir William Molesworth. The report noted how the Committee of the National Gallery lacked rules of guidance and how, in 1845, a Treasury instruction recommended that the committee be responsible for choosing purchases. (Though as we have seen, this did not guarantee purchase.)

Ewart put the case for abolishing ex-officio trustees, Treasury appointment of trustees and a salaried Director (£1,000) and proposed that if the Director wanted to buy a painting he should communicate in writing to the trustees so that the decision could be made by more than a few people. The Select Committee also wanted Parliament to give the National Gallery a fixed sum and for it to move to S. Kensington. It described the main duty of management there as the buying of pictures and said the Director should have:

...not only a complete knowledge of styles of various masters and schools of art, and of the value both intrinsic and commercial, of their works, but also an enlightened taste in appreciating their several merits, to the exclusion of all partiality for particular schools, epochs or authors,
(PP 1852-53, p16)

Further, the report stated that just as it was true that design could not be studied using isolated specimens, so with art it was important to see the development of styles. It was also necessary to see the "rise and progress, as well as ... perfection" in art, so Giotto and Massaccio had to be seen in order to appreciate Raphael, Titian and Correggio. In the same way, said the report, that Chaucer and Spenser were in relation to Shakespeare and Milton. This policy, it added, required expansion and more financial help. In his evidence, Eastlake said he had been appointed as keeper (1843-1847, he was trustee in 1850 and later Director in 1855) by Peel who had said that "What was wanted was a judge of the Italian schools." (PP 1852-3, p.320) Eastlake also said he referred to Peel for help if there was no trustee meeting imminent and that Peel "regulated to a great extent the proceeding of the trustees. I considered that whenever he gave his assent to any measure, the assent of the trustees would follow as a matter of course..." (PP 1852-3, p.321) Eastlake looked on him as First Lord of the

Treasury as a representative of the trustees (even though at that time he was not an ex-officio trustee).⁴²

In 1860, as Director, Eastlake gave his views on the Gallery, saying it ran better, now, with its smaller group of trustees and that he wished to "see the collection as comprehensive as possible, so as to give a complete history of art."(*Parliamentary Papers*, 1860^a, p.384] (He also said he wanted to have prints and drawings but not sculpture as it would make visits tiring because you would have to go round different departments.) Thus he was in favour of a chronological arrangement which was suitable for a public gallery, though in a private house paintings should be placed so that they "look better". Layard also mentioned how the British Museum was not arranged on the same lines as a palace or house and that he believed a national museum should be formed:

...with reference to the history of civilisation, and should include every object of art of sufficient importance ... from preceding generations, bringing it down even to the present day. An object of art of no interest or beauty is of very little value through itself; but it may be of the greatest importance, as a link without which a collection would be incomplete; unless such a collection is arranged chronologically, it loses its real value,
(PP, 1860a, p377)

If the British Museum were arranged like this it would make its collection incomparable throughout Europe. Passavant, in the 1830's, described some 14th and 15th century pictures in Christchurch College Oxford and commented how they "are the more remarkable ... occurring so seldom in England where their worth according to the general appreciation (1978, of art ... is merely rated by their antiquity." Vol 1, p.331-332] This, from Layard's words, would still appear to be the case only as Waagen noted, by the 1850's, they were more common in various collections.

Layard, too, applied the idea of historical age and went to Assyrian art which he said was not interesting as *art* but because "it is an expression of a civilisation extinct and therefore forms a link in the history of mankind." This was so important, he added, that money should always be forthcoming for a museum "to complete a link that is wanting..." (PP 1860a, p380)

Ideas of what was artistic, beautiful and valuable (in terms of history) not only influenced the way objects were arranged but was part of a general view of civilisation and the ways in which it had progressed. In a passage (reminiscent of Playfair's description of Blacks he met in the U.S.A.) in which Waagen describes the British Museum's Egyptian statues, two colossal heads:-

...one in red granite, the head of Thutmes III (No.15), was found at Carnac, in ancient Thebes, in the year 1818, by the celebrated traveller Belzoni. The features resemble those of most Egyptian statues; the very broad nose, rather depressed at the root, and a little bent down at the tip, the lips thick, and, like the eyes, drawn up at the corners. The workmanship is of the most extraordinary sharpness and finish;... The other far more important head is that of the celebrated statue of the Pharaoh Rhamses the Great ... with equal excellence in the workmanship,... is incomparably more noble in form and expression. The nose from the bridge downwards is more prominent and not so broad; the slight drawing up of the corners of the mouth is by no means disagreeable, but, on the contrary, gives an expression of friendliness and mildness. The oval, too, is far less thick and swollen than usual. The whole gives the immediate impression of a noble, dignified, manly character. (Waagen, 1854, Vol 1, p.411)

Waagen praised the finish and "a knowledge in the indication of the sinews and muscles, of which the ordinary monuments of Egyptian sculpture give no idea..." in an arm from the statue to which the first head belonged. But most of his effusive praise is kept for Greek and Roman art.

Passavant too discussed the art from other cultures which he saw at the East India Company Museum. The "grotesque" Indian idols he said have "a beauty of workmanship which is really surprising." [Passavant, Vol 1, p.264] Why was it really surprising? Passavant does not say, but such comments reveal attitudes about Western civilisation and its superiority. The anatomical realism of the Renaissance is presented as a Western achievement when he described old Persian miniature paintings which were like:

...similar miniature paintings of European origin, belonging to the 15th century. In spirit of execution the resemblance is striking, but the Easterns far outdo us in that easy position of the human figure, which we only attained in any perfection long subsequent to that period.
(Passavant, 1978, Vol I, pp.264-265)

The Persians were ahead until "we" outstripped them later but they were, "in common with most Eastern nations, ... ignorant of all the helps of light and shade, and utterly set at defiance of every rule of chiaro-
(Passavant, 1978, oscuro and perspective." p.265) Nevertheless, Passavant says, we owe the Persians much in terms of the decorative arts. The Indian paintings were elegant and although the animals were not drawn with "strict correctness", the artists have imitated nature and the animals are expressive of character. The elephants are wise and gentle and the monkeys cunning. The Chinese, Passavant continues, have a similar delicacy of form in their art, "notwithstanding the discouraging
(Passavant, 1978, insipidity of the national character." pp.267-268) All the above, however, will always be inferior, for:

Like the mis-shapen conceptions of a disordered imagination, the uncouth and mysterious monsters of their native mythology, bid defiance to all the rules of beauty and art. The ideal perfection of the Greeks, and the higher aspirations of the Christian nations, which

exited the genius of painting at once to do homage to the spiritual forms of religion, and to the beautiful realities of nature, are advantages denied both to the Eastern painters, and to their Egyptian brethren before them, to whom these endless avenues of improvement are thickly shrouded in the mists of a monstrous and unnatural superstition. Hence it is that their pictures are only pleasing and intelligible when confined to historical subjects, of comparatively modern date, or when borrowed from the never-failing interest of common life.

(Passavant, 1978, Vol I, p269)

These attitudes are seen in greater relief in connection with ethnological items, or, as Wittlin says, the "implements of peoples of primitive material culture"[Wittlin, p.138] of the sort Pitt-Rivers collected and studied. Originally they were mostly objects of curiosity and were included from the start of the British Museum as part of Sloane's collection (including American Indian pipes and Eskimo carvings). In 1845, however, a gallery was opened especially for ethnological specimens.[Wittlin, 1949, p.139, from - pp 1846, XXV, No.217, p.10] In 1860 Panizzi complained that although they never bought anything for the ethnological collection it was increasing all the time and that the trustees found themselves accepting objects rather than offend "one who means well..." (PP1860b, p.235] He professed acknowledgement of ethnography's importance but wanted, as did all the witnesses of the 1860 Select Committee of the British Museum, to move it to a place where it would have the space to be arranged scientifically. A progressive arrangement was necessary so that visitors could see the earliest art up to the more perfect developments. In an 1857 report to the trustees, however, Panizzi said the British Museum should only concern itself with "classical" antiquities and that it could go anywhere as long as he was no longer responsible for it. He defined ethnography as the arts and crafts of "primitive" peoples and the treasures of China, India

and the New World.[See Sir F. Francis, 1971, p.20] The growth of these collections are described by Mordaunt-Crook as representing "the flotsam of empire turned into an anthropologist's dream." p.208] Wittlin, too, relates them to "the interest of imperialistic policy in strengthening the control by civilised nations over people of primitive material culture." p.140] Duncan and Wallach see them in terms of ideas of civilisation and say:

In today's European and American museums, exhibitions of Oriental, African, Pre-Columbian and Native American art function as permanent triumphal, processions testifying to Western supremacy and world domination,"
(1980, p449)

(Ethnology did not have a separate department until 1946 and was by then at S. Kensington. By 1967, 95% of the collection was in storage, but in 1970, there was a separate building for it in Burlington Gardens and it is called the Museum of Mankind which presents ethnography in arranged "life" scenes.)

The 1860 Select Committee, however, felt that another place should be found as the British Museum was becoming a "depository" for such collections. There were discussions about arranging the Museum differently. One argument *for* separation went as far as to advocate separating the Christian and pre-Christian collections (with Constantine as a rough dividing line). The pagan art (including British and Anglo-Roman), would stay in the British Museum and the rest go to another place. Those against the idea of division said it was desirable for the *British* collections to stay in the *British* Museum for they were like fossils to a geologist. The Medieval should stay, anyway, because it showed the "progress of art, or the manners and customs, and mental

culture of various nations" and form a link in the "great chain which it would be most prejudicial to scientific investigation to (PP 1860b, disconnect." p.179] These ideas were further supported by the labelling and arrangement of items which were organised in accordance with them. These ideas were part of the educational debate and were validated by experts and connoisseurs. They were presented as an impartial viewpoint, genuinely seen as such and generally unquestioned, in the same way as Kay-Shuttleworth professed that he was for education of the people because it sowed "the germs of truth and virtue." [Quoted in P. Corrigan, 1980a, p.155] The decisions of experts on arrangement of objects obviously had an impact on labelling and catalogues. In the next section we see how various views on them reveal attitudes towards visitors and the educational role of museums.

Labelling and Catalogues

The National Gallery and the British Museum did not seriously consider labelling and catalogues for the public until the mid-nineteenth century. This changed when there was an increasing emphasis on the educational role. A brief look at some complaints illustrates some of the issues, (some already touched upon), and shows how interrelated different areas are.

In 1841, the Keeper of Antiquities and Coins at the British Museum, Edward Hawkins, complained about the lighting in the various departments (and also that the final decision was left to the trustees and they did not always follow the advice of the department). (*Parliamentary Papers* 1841, p.609] He stated that the lighting was fine for the Egyptian

collection "that are not works of high art; I do not think it would be good light for Roman or Greek sculpture." Waagen, too, complained of the lighting in some collections he saw and that it impaired his viewing. Silk Buckingham also made the same points about the Royal Museum in the Hague, where, he said, there were no lights above, but only side lights "while some of the pictures are placed so high as to be beyond the reach of careful examination ... This is a great defect ... "[p.368] Passavant criticised Hampton Court for this and on a trip to the British Museum he said he was dismayed at its interior. "On the tip-toe of expectation we entered the doors of the British Museum, and how deeply we were disappointed by the first coup d'oeil of the interior ... " but the Elgin Marbles which had once "glistened beneath the sunny skies of Greece," were "here crowded in a dirty, dark apartment, and loaded with the defiling accumulations of London soot and dust." [Vol.1, 1978, p.15] Elizabeth Rigby, as Passavant's translator, adds a note, that a new gallery had been built which enhanced the marbles' beauty. [Described in the *Penny Magazine* No.38, Nov. 3rd 1832]

The National Gallery, too, was criticised for the arrangement of its paintings and lack of space, even after its move to Trafalgar Square. (In the 1820's and '30's they were hung in triple tiers and there were also the chairs and easels of the copyists to impair viewing.) The Select Committee on Works of Art considered a new site but decided against it and hinted that the R.A. should move. Ewart and Haydon, in the 1830's, argued vigorously that, as an independent body, the R.A. should not go to Trafalgar Square. The R.A. exhibitions were also packed with paintings. As Haydon, of the unfortunate one-man show said, "what are modern Exhibitions? Nothing but a collection of the greatest possible number of

works in the smallest possible space to save the greatest number of painters from succumbing [to] the Whig Unions." [Quoted by Gordon Fyfe in a seminar on the decline of the R.A. 1850-1900, Keele University, 25.2.80]⁴⁻³

The questions of labelling and the provision of catalogues occur in the select committees of the 1830's to the 1860's and in those also not specifically discussing the presentation of exhibits. In 1860, T.H. Huxley (Prof. of Natural History with the Geological Society and Curator of its Palaeontological Collections) complained that the public did not get value for money with museums because no museum exhibited in a way that would make the collections as useful as they could be. He said that museums should be more instructive, with well-written catalogues and a good arrangement of specimens. (PP, 1860b, p.61) Like

numerous others, Huxley said that museums weaned the working classes from degrading pursuits and he was in favour of them paying a small sum for voluntary education like lectures as "people care more for what they pay a little for."

In 1835, at the Arts and Manufacture Select Committee, Waagen called for a short catalogue for the "ignorant" and Ewart suggested the putting up of notices with information on the schools of painters' which could provide the basis for dividing the gallery. Names and dates could also be added. Waagen said he already did this in Germany. Mr. Gilbourn, Warder of the Tower, was, however, even against labels as he preferred to explain things himself "for it keeps the party together, as the warder moves, (PP, 1835, they move," p.592) and visits generally took one hour or less. The 1860 Select Committee on evening visits was *for* labels saying "that clear, legible labels in English, placed against specimens, and simple catalogues

sold at a small cost, as well as occasional short popular lectures, are much appreciated by the working classes ... " (PP 1860c, p.3) Robert Morrell, the goldsmith, was in favour of such lectures in the evening, as you could sit down, whereas in a museum you had to walk around which was tiring after a days work, (he preferred Sundays for museums). He criticised the use of Latin labels and asked for "plain English" with more details on the object. Latin was alright for scholars "but the mere visitor wants to know something of the history of what he is looking at." Ruskin, too, was in favour of a "large printed explanation beneath "otherwise the worker, he said, wanders listlessly, gradually tires and goes home or to the pub."⁴⁴ Although there was still, in the 1860's, a strong scholar ethic (especially in the British Museum) which has survived, such discussions as above show the pressures on museums to provide a greater *public* service and to perceive themselves as part of the voluntary educational system. The working classes, it would appear, were all to become alcoholics if museums did not open up to them. Thus, the concern with presentation and communication (as well as opening hours). The question of catalogues had implications about the public for whom they were produced, often indicated by the price and details given in them. Cheap catalogues were advocated by the 1841 Select Committee and their division into sections by class or department. They were, it said:

A valuable mode of disseminating knowledge, and rendering those collections generally more useful, It is also recommended that a small tablet should be attached to each object in the collection, containing the name or subject, and also to works of art, the artist's name and date.
(PP 1841, p442)

In 1841, the National Gallery's catalogue was one shilling, which, the attendant confessed, was dear, but, he added, people had only refused (PP, 1841, to buy one due to the high cost "about twenty times." p.585) (He does not, however, mention those who perhaps would not have dared to think to buy one, or who already knew they were dear and avoided them.) A measure of the inextricable links between catalogues and arrangements (and, therefore, experts) can be seen in an interesting exchange during the 1841 Select Committee's evidence, Thwaites, (Assistant Keeper and Secretary, National Gallery) was asked:

Q: Are you able to give an opinion as to how far a catalogue different from the present one might be made out, classed according to schools, and sold at a lower price than the present catalogue?

Thwaites:

If the pictures were so hung then I think the catalogue could be so made out, but not otherwise,

Q: As they are now mixed, you think the present catalogue is the best?

Thwaites replied that the numbers given the pictures never changed and therefore the catalogue was always useful. If a new painting came, it was given a new number. When asked; "As they are now mingled, Italian, Flemish, English and Spanish, you think the present catalogue the best?" Thwaites said he thought it was. But he added that the paintings were not mingled as suggested:

They are arranged as nearly as possible according to the schools, that is, the Great-room is entirely filled with Italian pictures; the next greatest room is all Flemish with a few of the superfluity of Italian pictures the third room is filled again with some of the inferior Italian pictures and some new acquisitions of Italian pictures and English pictures,

(PP 1841, p.583)

Thwaites was then asked if there was, therefore, an attempt to classify pictures by schools and he said: "As far as circumstances would permit, we were instructed to do it."⁴⁵ When Passavant saw the collection in the early 1830's, then in Pall Mall, he *noted* the various schools but Waagen over twenty years later saw how they were broken down into Venetian, Florentine and so on.

In 1860, Wornum, (Secretary and Keeper), told the Select Committee on evening opening that the National Gallery now sold four types of catalogue. The shilling one could not be sold at a profit, so there was one at "very nearly one shilling", one at 4d - a digest of the dearest catalogue, one at 1d which was a list of the pictures and one at 6d which was a catalogue of the English paintings at S. Kensington.⁴⁶

(PP 186Q, p.361 Arrangements of paintings and catalogues are inextricably bound together, were sources of dispute and confirmation of authenticity and presented a definite view of progress.

This thesis has concentrated on England 1830-1860, which was a time of great importance in the development of the museum and strategies to get "the people" to visit them. In the last part we attempt a brief and therefore inevitably unsatisfactory, survey of twentieth century developments, the modern expert, purchasing policy, arrangement of paintings, museums as part of the tourist industry, the controversy about entrance charges and the ideas that underlie them. This last section has been included because one of the functions of history is to inform about the present and we discuss whether ideas of progress in relation to museums have changed.

Modern Developments: A brief survey

Before concluding, we will make a few brief and comparative observations of recent events in the light of some of the developments in the 19th Century. Although we can, here, do no more than skim the surface, it is hoped that some relevant points will emerge about acquisitions, experts, entrance fees and funding; newer developments including the stately home and "social history" or the "folk museum". The former involves a temporary appropriation of the upper class mystique based on distance and luxury and the latter (and to some extent the former) on the "reality" of the experience.

A glimpse at some of the directors of the larger museums illustrates the similarities with someone like Eastlake of the last century. Timothy Clifford, (six years in charge of the Manchester City Art Gallery before moving on to the Scottish National Gallery in 1984) has been described as "an all-round connoisseur". [*The Guardian*, 22.9.84, p.10] Eastlake would surely have agreed with his comment that "Wives can be most helpful to art gallery Directors". His wife, (as art critic for *The Daily Telegraph* and adviser to the Laura Ashley business) probably was so. There were also rumours that he was helpful to her by mounting a Laura Ashley exhibition at Manchester. Clifford apparently maintained close links with the dealers and had a great deal of influence on acquisitions, showing a preference for modern art. He did, however, manage to arrange the acquisition of a £1.8 million Duccio, due to his connections in Parliament and the Treasury. He pursued the painting with a "patriotic fervour" and saved it for the nation. [*The Guardian*, 22.9.84]

The number of "old masters" coming on to the market is falling (which has led one European Director to create more thematic exhibitions) but there are still close links between purchasing and ideas of progress, and Directors can still often be in line for knighthoods. Cynics, says Bevis Hillier, suggest that Roy Strong held on to his position at the Victoria and Albert in the hope of becoming a "Sir", a distinction now conferred on him. [*The Observer Magazine*, - a series 'The Great Museum Guide (GMG) No.1, p.60] Others like Maxwell Hebditch of the Museum of London and Dr. David Wilson of the British Museum are reported to be well liked. (Hebditch is said to queue for his sandwiches in the canteen along with his colleagues, which some like and others consider beneath his dignity. GMG, 29th June, 1980, p.60) Wilson has been described as public-oriented and says he wants to get people inside the museum and generate their real enthusiasm. He prefers voluntary visits as opposed to the bussing in of school children.

Sir Michael Levey of the National Gallery is said to be a quiet man who nevertheless enjoys the wheeling and dealing part of his job. Michael Davis in *The Observer* said that "The reputation of gallery directors depends on what they acquire." [*The Observer* 12.12.82, p.14] Similar to Eastlake, Levey is described as "an eminent art historian, aged fifty-five, animated and friendly ... He is personally in charge of the National Gallery's picture buying: he sets the policy and he himself does the negotiating. He also keeps the secrets." Davies discusses the purchase of "two major paintings" (Renoir and Monet) in 1982 and the National Gallery's announcement of it when "No occasion could have been more civilised." The private treaty sale meant that Lord Annan, Chairman of the Trustees, could not reveal the name of the seller or the price although,

obviously, the trustees and Director knew (and the Minister for the Arts also had ways of finding out) but Parliament and other people could not be told.⁴⁶ Mr. Gibson, the dealer for the Renoir and Monet, referred to the secrecy as "natural English reticence", but Levey himself confesses to enjoying the dealing and says, guiltily: "It's a terrible thing to say, but I find it great fun, thrashing out a deal. And I'm the one who is going to be advising the trustees what to buy, and what to pay." Levey, however, complains about lack of money, saying "Our grant is now less than it was in 1980. I tend to feel these days that the gallery would be much better off if it was in the Falklands." Complaints on this topic reached a peak in 1984 when the National Gallery had its grant cut. Soon after J.P. Getty III gave them £50 million and was hailed in Parliament (17.6.85) by Mr. Waldegrave, the Arts Minister, as "a new Mycenae come among us." Much is to be invested for future income. It also got another private subsidy from Sir John Sainsbury for the building of an extension.

Lord Gowrie, commenting on the National Gallery's recent purchase for £1.5 million of a Wright painting said, "It is for the trustees to decide what to acquire for the collection and how much they are prepared to pay." [*The Guardian*, 2.4.85.] Thus the decisions are still in the hands of a very few people (and the government's moves to make museums semi-independent has given trustees more power), and in some cases are initiated and argued through by only one, in the position of Director. At the Tate the business of acquisitions was aired publicly in 1979 when Hockney attacked Sir Norman Reid (then Director of the Tate) for his purchasing policy. In the article in *The Observer* (4.3.79) called 'No Joy at the Tate', Hockney said that the Tate should be a record of British Art and be more *inclusive*. Purchases were too close to the personal likes and

dislikes of Reid and his theories about art. Reid, said the artist, should see what is *there* and buy that, and that since he had become Director (1964), there had been no Lowry purchases, or Allen Jones or David Oxtoby. And, they only had two of his own. The bias in favour of non-representational art led to the sterility of Carl André's 'Bricks', which, Hockney said, was only art in the context of a gallery. In the street people would step over it whereas a Van Gogh was a source of joy in any environment. He complained that the American acquisitions lacked the realism of Hopper and that as a whole, purchasing was shrouded in too much secrecy with too much power in the hands of bureaucrats.

In his reply (11.3.79) Reid refuted this last point saying that there were reports every two years including a catalogue of acquisitions. This does not really answer Hockney's point about actual decision making and later Reid admits that the Director of the Tate has "almost complete control over acquisitions policy... his taste and predilections shape the collection." This, he said, was why abstraction had dominated but the Director did have to win over the trustees and could not force them to agree. He continued that personally he was not very enthusiastic about conceptual work (eg., 'Bricks') but "Like women, one may admire many but no one can expect to love them all." (It would be interesting to explore this analogy in terms of women as objects or works of art and possessions. See above, p.357.) Reid is saying that within his taste he also tries to have representations of major developments. His reply "Buying the Best", qualifies this by saying that the Tate is more interested in quality than the inclusion of every approach to art. He bought André's work because he was sure of its quality, not because of a theory. Taken within the framework of Reid's description of the Director's

and trustees' roles his statements have qualifications which almost amount to contradictions. His personal taste has dominated *but* he has had to include artistic developments. He may not like the art but he has to include art of quality. (He does not attempt to say how to distinguish between the two.) The purchase of abstract work is dominant (although as he points out, the Tate has a large figurative holding in older British art and in some of the foreign works, eg., Cézanne.) Ideal completeness (a term Reid acknowledges) is, he says, sacrificed to "the intensity of experience offered by the collection built up along the lines of personal conviction..." He concludes that the Tate is not here to trace artistic development but to represent humanity at its best. Paradoxically, he believes that this is the best way to trace artistic development (as opposed to Hockney's idea of buying what is there) and really is no different from a selective purchasing policy to show the progress of art. The arrangement bears this out, showing a "relay-race" from Cézanne to the Fauves, Cubism and total abstraction. Eastlake would have understood Reid, for he too professed he did not like certain art ('early' Italian) but bought it.

Richard Cork in an article on the extension at the Tate criticised Reid precisely for his art-historical orthodoxy. He called the extension "A gigantic hanger-like slab" in which "477 paintings and prints are hung like postage stamps crammed onto the pages of an album by a collector." [*Art Monthly*, No.28, 1979, p.17] The congestion is accentuated by 151 sculptures and the result akin to a battery farm with a dispassionate chic." Cork also complains about the three-tier hanging which means that "enjoyment gives way to glum duty, a ticking off of artists' names, curational paraphernalia." The 'isms' are all there

(Impressionism, Post-impressionism, Fauvism, Expressionism etc.) and Cork says the effect is heightened by a last room called "Further aspects of Painting and Sculpture 1958-1976." This room contained the works the arrangers found difficult to slot into the main exhibition (eg. Op and Kinetic art and post-painterly Abstraction). Cork says that Reid based it on the modern collection on the Museum of Modern Art in New York (MOMA). Waldemar Januszczac in a recent article said of MOMA, "It is here that the baton-passing view of modern art history was developed and put into practice, largely to legitimise the American contribution to modern art."["Has Modernism died so that we can live again?" *The Guardian*, 22.8.84, p.9] Moreover, this is promoted in their displays and as a method going back into the last century has always excluded those who did not fit into the mainstream. (It has always omitted many women artists.) Cork accuses the Tate of marooning art away from life where its only context is in the catalogue and label which addresses the cognoscenti.⁴⁷

Cork, further, disliked the Tate's clinical atmosphere in the new extension which he said was accentuated by the scientifically controlled lighting (photoelectric cells) and humidity which he interprets as putting consideration before the public. One museum worker, Peter Cannon Brookes (keeper of Fine Art at the National Museum of Wales) advocated that this should be the case. In 'Museums: a bad case of rot' [*The Guardian*, 27.4.81, p.9] he argued that museums are firstly places of scholarship, storehouses, and for the conservation of objects. A collection, he said, is held on trust "for the world community" and therefore it is "absurd" to include museums as part of a leisure and recreation service. Cuts should be made, if they must, in the secondary services first, such as the National Slide Collection and, he added, "The

maintenance of security, for example, takes precedence over keeping the galleries open to the public." Cannon Brookes recognised that museums have a role in the intellectual life of the nation and reasoned that as museum objects have an intrinsic value they should be cherished themselves. (This view is challenged by 'activity' or social history museums which very often depend on tourists.) Cannon Brookes has (1985-6) been involved in a controversy. He took responsibility for the decision of the National Museum to send a collection of Impressionist works for a tour of department stores in Japan. The education staff at the museum complained. Cannon Brookes' motives were thought to be mainly financial. At the Tate, Reid's successor, Alan Barnes (similar to Clifford) emphasises the need for a museum Director to have political know-how and have civil service connections. He also needs charm and persuasion to obtain gifts, bequests and extra government money. For, he says, often a "quiet word in the right ear is the way to make things happen."["The Most influential man in British Art", by Gordon Burns, *The Observer Magazine*, 15.6.84., p.66] Barnes, married to a daughter of Barbara Hepworth, educated at Cambridge and the Courtauld, says he is an individualist who never votes (he was a conshie in 1946). He gave up being a critic because he felt that artists, not critics, "actually dictate the development of art." [p.68] He agreed with Reid that the 'Bricks' was a serious work of art and he added that the Director's job is "to make clear to the public who he thinks the major figures of contemporary art are." The thrill of his job is in being a part of a process of establishing the greats, of adding them to the art historical line and he states:

The real challenge about new art ... is precisely the fact that the evaluations are not made for you, Studying the art of the past you *know* who the great figures are; The interest lies in attempting to

make people see these established artists in a new way. But in contemporary art, the process of ... establishing that so-and-so is better than somebody else is just beginning and the excitement comes from knowing you're able to play a part in that.

He believes he is a good judge saying that he was buying Hockney for the Arts Council twenty years ago and that he knew quality because he has seen such a great deal of art. Like Lady Eastlake, he believes that talent and quality will "out". For Barnes, the artist starving in a garret is a myth, for if he was good he would succeed. He, therefore, seems to discount historical and political biases and although he says he has a great influence on the pattern of art, we must trust his objectivity. We must not forget, he says, that he has trained as an art historian, "and art historians are trained to be objective in their reactions to paintings." He is in the tradition of Eastlake and the neutral expert idea.⁴⁶ Barnes wants to buy "name" artists, and the new Chairman of the trustees would not disagree, although they have clashed over which names. Peter Palumbo, a rich businessman/collector said, just prior to taking up the position in June 1984 that he would apply the same criteria to painting for the Tate as he did to his own collection. He would ask, "Is it the best there is? Is it good of its kind? Can I afford it?"['Tycoon with designs on the Tate' by Deyan Sudjic, *The Sunday Times Magazine*, 29.4.84, p.42] He talks of "my administration" which he wished to mark with "a major purchase" criticising the Tate for buying the minor and the second-rate. He also wanted to spend more on "first-rate works by established figures." As a trustee he was part of a group (including the sculptor Carò and architect Richard Rogers) unhappy with Barnes' policy on purchases. One argument was about the alleged refusal of the

Director to buy a "first-quality" Matisse because the Tate already represented Matisse.

What appears to be two different standpoints are, at closer scrutiny, essentially on different points on the same spectrum. Whether purchased or not, the Matisse would fill its allotted space in the collection and the art bought would be conferred with the greatness of those other works of art which are given importance by being in the Tate and by being part of art history. What we are witnessing between Palumbo and Barnes is a power struggle between the intellectual art historian and the intellectual businessman who have more in common than otherwise.

Some further modern developments.

On the eve of the 1950's Alma Wittlin wrote that American museologists strongly believed that large public museums would be superseded by "small museums of a variety of types." Also,

If the museum is truly to fulfil the function of a public institution in a democratic society it must cease to be represented by a limited number of colossal accumulations of objects immured in huge buildings and accessible, physically and mentally, to limited numbers of people brought into contact with these hoards by their incidental presence in a particular vicinity or by the privilege of their education and calling,

(Wittlin, 1949, p193)

Museums of the future, said Wittlin, would be more "genuine" in character, less conspicuous, and places like libraries would have visiting exhibitions. Sites of historical interest will have "Trailside Museums" and these and "Historical Houses", "will be objectives of the motorist, of the great masses of the future." To a large extent this is what has happened.

Public museums in Britain grew in number as follows:

Pre 1850	- less than 60 museums
1900	- 200
1914	- 350
1928	- 530
1963	- 876
1973	- 950

[From the *Standing Committee Report* 1973, p.2]

Kenneth Hudson reckons that in 1985 there are over 2,000 museums (including private ones) in Britain and he includes 400 of these in his good museum guide.['Packaging the Past', *New Society*, No.1169, Vol.72, 23.5.85, p.270] Some of these are specialist museums concentrating on typewriters, lamp-posts, toys, theatre memorabilia, gardening and butterflies.[see *GNG*, No.2, p.41] Peter Quennell (ex-editor of *History Today*) wrote that every age has a museum reflecting its needs from cabinets centuries ago to the modern museum, a point which we shall return to later. There have of course been changes, however. The British Museum now has huge exhibitions to draw the public, epitomised by one curator as "Death and Gold". The 1972 Tutankhamun exhibition sold 1½ million tickets and earned a lot of money.

In the 19th century some voiced fears that working class people would come and go to museums and be none the wiser. Nowadays there are great efforts to "involve" the visitor. In a recent radio programme there was a discussion about the Imperial War Museum.[Radio 4, 'Stop the Week', 11.5.85] All those on the programme had visited it specially. There was plenty of machinery, but "where were the people?" was one question. It was felt that the War Museum left out the story of ordinary people and indeed some museums now not only involve the visitor but have staff acting the roles of the people of the time. (One participant said it celebrated male

aggression and interest in weapons and that the statements were bland, of the "war has always been here" variety, and the bald statement that now we had the means for destroying the world. Laurie Taylor from York University said it had an "evolutionary quality" and needed a "more human aspect". Robert Robertson added that Charles Jagger sculptures exuded a "shared triumphantism" and that he felt the Museum mixed "guilt and glamourising."

Places like Sudbury Hall with its Children's Museum where children can climb inside a chimney like a chimney-sweep, museum trails and worksheets, try to involve its visitors. The Natural History Museum, with its 4 million children each year does the same. Its Saturday club is (GMG, "reputed to be as hard to get into as Eton". 2, p.52) It began to change under Sir Frank Claringbull who brought back ideas from a trip to America in 1973 and announced that his target audience would be aged 15 and that they would use computers and assorted visual aids. (In 1977 it had 3 million visitors a year and was Museum of the Year in 1980.) The National Gallery also tried to involve children in the 1970's and now many museums around the country link up with schools, hold workshops etc.

Kenneth Hudson sees the development of variously funded, open-air, on-site museums with an emphasis on telling the story of the past as a post-war movement. Industrial museums may conjure up expectations of "human context" but topics such as wage rates and accidents can be left out. There are at least 20 on-site museums, including Beamish, The Gladstone Pottery Museum, Chatterly Whitfield, Styal, The Miners Museum, Port Talbot etc. Beamish, the North of England Open Air Museum, says Martin Leighton, "offers the visitor a remarkable opportunity to step

back into the past and experience the life-styles of older generations."(*GNG*, 1980, No.10, p.33) Chatterley Whitfield opened in 1979 and had over 75,000 visitors in the first 16 months.(*Newcastle News*, 15.5.81) It was announced as a chance to see "first hand" by the Chairman of the trustees and that "everything here is for real" and that it was a real mine not a "clinical representation of one." Jonathan Bryant, the Director, explained the interest in it thus: "people are fascinated being underground. I think it all dates back to cave man days; they possess some basic instinct to see what it is like." Perhaps some of the visitors wanted to see where many relatives had spent so much of their time outside the home and to learn about mining and industrial history which would be local history for many visitors.⁴⁹

Many other museums pride themselves on the "authenticity" of experience. The Gladstone (Museum of the Year 1976) publicity tells us "you can imagine the smokey environment and the bustling atmosphere..." The leaflet for the Bass Museum emphasises facilities and family visits and says a visitor will "step back into history to the 11th century when beer was first brewed at Burton by monks..." At Ironbridge, the Blist's Hill site "takes you back in time to a typical East Shropshire industrial community of the 1890's." Croxteth Hall and County Park produce literature which tells us to "Step back into the leisurely world of eighty years ago, on this unique and beautiful example of a working estate ... At Croxteth, former seat of the Earl of Sefton, you can sample the Edwardian lifestyle side by side with a host of other enjoyable things to do." At Speke Hall, we can "spend an afternoon in 'Ye Merrie Olde England' - admission to the Hall, guided tour, traditional cream tea..." (Cream teas were it appears a part of 'Olde England') At Beamish they aimed "to recreate a complete

situation, but also to make it possible for visitors to *experience* this in the same degree." [First Report of the North of England Open Air Museum Joint Committee, 1978, p.5] Frank Atkinson who headed Beamish said in 1971 "We like to think that even our indoor exhibition was not too museum-like." These museums are seen by government and by themselves as tourist attractions. A Stoke-On-Trent councillor stated that Chatterly Whitfield was part of what the city had to offer the visitor. [*The Sentinel*, 12.4.82] A look at a considerable number (over 40) of guides and leaflets for museums, stately homes and historical sites confirm this idea. The 1973 Standing Committee on provincial museums encouraged this and said that they should advertise themselves better in order to take some of the pressure off the London museums. [3.4] The onus for extra money needed should, said the Committee, come from *local government* (although some central help was available through the V & A whereby 50% was granted for items, but this was criticised by many museums as being too small.) It is an important shift away from the 19th Century idea that provincial museums are places to recieve copies and mini-versions of larger museums. (The 1973 Standing Committee stated that everyone should have an "important collection" including Arts, Archeology, Ethnology and Social History, Natural Science, Industry and Technology within 25-30 miles of their home.) [4.9] The 1973 Report also pointed out that "the majority of people look nearer home for their visits to museums," but it recognised the importance of tourism. This latter point is seen in the case of Beamish.

Beamish was an idea for 20 years before becoming a reality during the 1970's. It had an exhibition in 1976 to show how it was developing into a museum and it attracted over 200,000 people and £100,000. It was

then that the marketing for the summer of 1977 began.⁵⁰ The majority of visitors in July and August were tourists (defined as those spending more than one night away from home) and 12% of these were from abroad. They brought in over £3,000,000 to the eight miles around Beamish.[Beamish - First Report, p.11]

At Ironbridge, an independent museum, there are many sites. The guide book tells us that Coalbrookdale Museum of Iron shows the story of iron "one of the foundations of modern civilisation." The Blist's Hill site has staff in the shops, the pub and various workshops who are dressed in period costume. Indeed, the visitor can dress up in it for photographs. Once through the modern entrance/turnstile building, with its "air-hostess" type assistants, a visitor can bump into a 19th century toll- gate keeper or squatter. In the squatter's cottage (complete with its pig outside) an attendant sits and waits for visitors. She begins her talk when you all assemble, whereas the toll- gate man waits for you to ask questions. Styles vary, depending on the staff encountered, and it can be a self-conscious experience for the visitor although the situation allows 'on the spot' questions about conditions, machinery, and so forth. One realises the impossibility of reliving the past and the difficulties of trying to achieve this. One can, however, see everyday objects in the setting in which they were used, try to compare life then with now and get an idea of the size of objects and houses. Donald Horne expresses some of these difficulties related to the obsession with authenticity:

'Authenticity' is the special magic of museums. In a technological museum, it is not that this is the *kind* of steam engine that Watt constructed that makes it interesting, but that it is the *very* steam engine Watt constructed. In an art museum, it is not that this painting is beautiful, but that it is an *authenticated* Rembrandt. In a history museum, it is not that this is the *kind* of hat that Napoleon wore, but that this is the *very* hat Napoleon wore. Such an emphasis on

authenticity, provides a radiance of value and scarcity that hallows the object in itself, so that often a museum provides not an account of social processes, but a collection of isolated objects, sacred in themselves,

[Horne, 1984, pp16-17)

(This is also seen in such things as the auctioning of Beatle's clothes and cars which recently have fetched very high prices.)

At Ironbridge, "the cradle of the Industrial Revolution," the emphasis is on famous people and objects, although this is modified by Blist's Hill and may be more so when it is completed. Horne, however, on his European tour, encountered many places where there is "such a worship of the object-in-itself that they do not tell its history; we are confronted by objects without social processes." p.249] (Horne, 1984, He refers to such places as national museums and military and ethnological collections. He says that museums in communist countries, are, on the whole, superior "in principle", because they do not assume the object tells a story in itself. In fact, Horne believes we should get away from the need for authentic objects and use reproductions and photographs and that paintings should be scattered around public buildings to be re-assumed into "ordinary life, like advertisements and political slogans."

Horne attempts to show that tourism is an activity which embodies much which is conservative and it is "using the past as a therapeutic (1984, fantasy." p.251] Marie Antoinette's death is portrayed as martyrdom and monuments can be manipulated to justify the present. Like Grana, Horne says that tourism is mostly about "admiring the relics of (1984, hereditary privilege," p.95] and this includes the treasure houses of the USSR too. Guide books reinforce this. As Roland Barthes wrote, they do (1976 not "tell us, of course, how this fine prosperity is shared out." [Barthes, p.77] The term "stately home" has been described by one writer as a cosy

term belying those "huge buildings which have been centres of power effecting the lives of hundreds and thousands." [Neal Ascherson, *The Observer* 1.9.85, p.7] Like the paintings that museums try to stop being exported we are told they are part of "our heritage." It is a heritage that surprises many visitors from abroad. Lady Mary Clive, ['Good Museum Guide' No.6, p.35] describes how Italian visitors to the Fitzwilliam in Cambridge have "that my-God-we've been burgled, look." The Elgin marbles, too, are part of "our heritage." The stately home, in common with Royalty, has a quality which at once gives out the glamour and mystique of distance and yet tries to appear approachable and human. This is controlled by the object of admiration to a greater extent than the spectator. Royalty can be projected as hard *workers*, mothers, fathers and so on, and as the princesses in evening gown. The Earl of Bradford, who runs West Park, a 13,000 acre family estate, opens it to the public. He lives in a relatively small house near the grand one. In an article called "We never tell visitors we don't live at Weston," he describes how he likes to give the impression the family lives in the big house. This maintains an exalted image but a "homely" touch is added, for, he says, "it's stuffed with recent photographs of us all. They love seeing the kids and Joanne wandering around although they often think she's the nanny." [*Sunday Times Magazine* 24.2.85, p.74] He feels possessive about seeing strangers trudge all over "my property" and that if anyone "turns round and walks out I take that as a personal rejection."⁵¹ Stately homes have become businesses, hiring out their grounds for photography sessions, car promotions, and introducing ever more sophisticated fair-ground rides. At Alton Towers the main attraction is the fair and at others you can go to a safari park. In the last century, there were some

similar places, the connoisseur visited stately homes and the working classes went to Hampton Court and one or two other places. In the 1880's Pitt-Rivers established a recreation ground on his estate in Dorset. The Larmer Grounds had attractions (to induce visitors to go to the museum there). It was free and had reindeer, kangaroos and other animals. The museum was some way off but easily reached by bicycle. The attractions in the grounds also included musical events with estate workers' bands, firework displays, skittles, bowls and picnics (for which crockery was provided). You could also buy alcoholic drinks. The grounds were a success, but the museum, of agricultural implements, peasant artifacts arranged to show cultural evolution, attracted less visitors. M.W. Thompson says that this was because "... the average visitor was probably bewildered by the densely packed exhibits. The normal person is usually not impressed by typology and is indeed sceptical of its significance except for museum display." [M.W. Thompson, 1977, p.85] (Visiting figures show the Larmer grounds were more popular:

Larmer: 1887 - 15,351	Museum: 1888 - 5,706
1899 - 44,417	1899 - 12,611

[Thompson, 1977, p.79]

In the last section we describe the criteria that the Museum of the Year panel use to decide which museum will win the award. Hudson relates this to the issue of entrance charges to museums which is the last topic discussed. It is particularly highlighted by recent developments at the V & A.

The Good Museum Guide and Admission Charges

Hudson says that the Museum of the Year Award is more likely to be won by museums who consider the "total experience." He edits the Good Museum Guide and sits on various panels including the Museum of the Year. A visitor should, he believes, "feel better" after going to a museum and this depends on eleven elements; the building, the collection, presentation, interpretation, museum publications, shop, educational programme, marketing, activities other than the overtly educational, comfort of visitors, general atmosphere and imagination. ["Packaging the Past", *New Society*, 23.5.85 No.1169, Vol.72, p.270] Generally, says Hudson, the large national museum compares unfavourably with many local or smaller museums because it usually sees the collection itself as "everything" with the public galleries as the mere "icing on the cake." Thus, the Louvre and British Museum do not match Scunthorpe Borough Museum, Chatterly Whitfield or Styal. Visitors wrote to him to give their opinions of what was good or bad about museums. They complained about unfriendly staff who may sit on all the seats and listen to the radio, displays being in a jumble, cold temperatures, bad lighting and outside toilets. They praised all the opposites of above criticisms including one writer who commented about a certain museum: "An honest place, which leaves the visitor in no doubt that art means wealth." Generally, Hudson discovered that people want museums that are not too big, are friendly, welcoming, have a good cafe and cheap shop, clean toilets, easy to understand labels and an atmosphere that does not make one nervous. Hudson does not mention museum charges here, but has entered this debate elsewhere. It is not an entirely new topic and was discussed by witnesses

in 1835. Generally, those in favour were those who did not believe in government funding for Schools of Design or education in general and there were also a few who felt greater value was placed on what was paid for. Hudson said something similar and that charges would also raise standards, when he stated: "if a museum charges, its visitors will demand value for money and be more critical. It isn't always more true that we value more what we pay for, but I do believe that it applies to museums today."['Museum Charges Are Good for the Paying Public', *Good Housekeeping* June, 1984, p.43] The S. Kensington Museum also charged 6d on student days to give the "ladies" a chance to visit. Hudson, however, sees the reluctance of museums to charge as a hangover from the idea that, like libraries, museums are places of "free" education. The scholar can be catered for, "But most visitors aren't scholars - they come to enjoy themselves and to learn a little in an informal way," he adds. Being in favour of admission charges, he argues, is being realistic. The issues involved in the debate on charges have been aired recently in a number of articles. Mick Hamer and Peter Wrobel, [*New Scientist* No.1471, 29.8.85, p.20-21] describe the outcry at attempts to introduce charges in the 1970's under Heath's government and how Margaret Thatcher, then Secretary of State for Education and Science, was one of its main advocates. In 1974, charges were introduced and turnstiles put into the Science Museum in London. The turnstiles were, however, put into the basement in April, when a new government came into office. The government now is seeking a more independent museum service and in July 1985, Lord Gowrie, the Arts Minister, announced new proposals to give museums only a fixed proportion of running costs. (The figures have been forecast at 95% of the costs in the first year with the hope of further reductions later.) Any money

given will be treated as grant-in-aid so that unspent sums which used to be paid back to the Treasury can be kept. The Commons spokesman on the Arts, William Waldegrave, in a recent written parliamentary reply from Lord Gowrie, said that he wished to support national museums and galleries "in sensible programmes of self-help." [In 'Return of the Turnstile', David White, *New Society*, No.1169 Vol.72, 23.5.85, p.278] David White calls it 'giving museums the incentive to charge.' The fact that the V & A have considered entrance charges and will soon, (4.11.85), introduce a voluntary system, shows a shift from the position in 1971 when along with the National Gallery, The Tate and The British Museum, it declared against charges in principle. (One museum's reaction to the idea of charges was seen in Bethnal Green's reply to a question about whether, like the Whitechapel Art Gallery, it was considering charging, "Of course not. We're civilised here, you know".)

Roy Strong at the V & A is for voluntary charges, saying "people should put something back." He argues that the museum gives free services to dealers who could pay for valuations. Strong complains that charges were not used to vilify the Greenwich museum. Charges, he says, are no more blackmail than church collections and they do not put people off going to the Festival Ballet, the National Theatre or to Salisbury Cathedral. It has, however, put visitors off the V & A, for in the first two months of operating the voluntary charges, the numbers of visitors have halved. [R4, 4.11.85] He has been described in a recent article as a Grammar school boy from the suburbs, who made good. (He went to the same school as Norman Tebbit.)

Strong's rise from the grammar school enthusiast who collected portraits of Elizabeth I, to Britain's premier art Knight, has been one of the fairy-tale success stories of New Conservatism.
[*The Guardian* 5.11.85]

He first worked at the National Portrait Gallery becoming its director in 1967 at the age of 32 and was also one of the "Faces of Swinging London" in the sixties wearing "kipper ties, floppy fedoras and a maxi coat" which he has now given to the V & A's Dress Collection. He now dresses in "gentleman's tweeds."

Lord Carrington, chairman of the trustees, is *for* voluntary charges too, and is willing to brave low attendances and union opposition "such is his concern for damp galleries, exploding radiators and badly-lit displays." ['In for a Penny' by John Cunningham. An interview with Lord Carrington, *The Guardian* 22.10.85, p.19] The V & A, says Carrington, needs to spend £26 million on renovation and hopes the charges will provide £500,000 in the first six months. The "admission contributions" will be £2 for adults and 50p for children over twelve and not in school groups, though Carrington professes he would be happy if everyone gave *something*. He compares British and foreign museums (which he visits when abroad on duty for NATO) and is saddened by "British parsimony" and that the V & A is shut on Fridays. The trustees, say John Cunningham of *The Guardian* are "distinguished busy-bodies" who are businessmen or involved in the Crafts Council and so on, and they have acquired more power in the last year and a half. Carrington, it seems, has taken on the V & A as a personal crusade, as Cunningham says, "He is defending a national treasure house as though it were his own stately home." The business ethic is emerging with ideas such as the V & A setting up companies

similar to Laura Ashley, to sell fabrics in V & A prints.[*The Guardian* 24.9.85 in 'Tuesday People' and 1.11.85] The success of the shop will become ever more important and a recent survey showed it was the most popular attraction.

Whereas the National Portrait Gallery makes nearly one fifth of its yearly revenue from its shop the one at the London Science Museum is barely surviving. According to Hamer and Wrobel, this means the Science Museum has to "introduce charges or dilute its independence by accepting sponsored exhibitions."(*New Scientist* p.20) Carrington commented on

the V & A saying that it would not contribute to "bread and butter things" but then he had "no objection ... to "G. Guggenheim Swshing broom" having his name on anything he sponsored."(Cunningham, *The Guardian*, 24.9.85).]

A well-known example of charging is the Greenwich Maritime Museum. The Director, Neil Cossens, had come there from Ironbridge, (which as an independent museum, charges), and of whom Hamer and Wrobel say: "Ironically ..., [he] is widely tipped to be appointed ... as the next director at the Science Museum."(*New Scientist* p.20) At the Maritime Museum there had been cutbacks forcing Monday closures and it was estimated charges would bring in an extra £500,000. (In fact, it took £360,000) Cossens spelled it out in August 1985 when he said "The present mood is one of changes in the balance of spending between the public and private sectors, with less money through the public. What is wrong with museums reflecting that switch from taxpayer to user?" Hamer and Wrobel, however, say that the revenue from charges is a drop in the ocean in terms of the overall £4.1 million budget and that, more importantly, the attendance figures have dropped 10-15%. Although no detailed

figures were kept before the charges, but there is "general agreement" that the figures are down between one tenth and one fifth.) They add that 12% of the extra money was absorbed in collecting it and £90,000 spent in advertising. The advertising campaign was organised by Saatchi and Saatchi (used by Margaraet Thatcher it has been called Thaatchi and Thaatchi). In 'The red badge rip-off', Waldemar Januszczak, [*The Guardian* 2.11.85] says this campaign gave it an image that does not match up to reality. The radio adverts emphasised naval engagements Britain had won and Januszczak comments:

Killing foreigners it seems is something the English have long been good at. Boasting about it and appealing to the jingoism of the audience was the method used ... to lure paying customers through its new turnstiles ..."

At the Science Museum, where 45% of visitors are under 20 years of age and there are 5,000 or so school trips a year, the educational role of the museum is important. Hamer and Wrobel are concerned that the new financial package will cause it to suffer. If schools are charged this could present difficulties. The Royal Society of Chemistry has also criticized the government in the same spirit as they complained about proposals for VAT on books. Wilson at the British Museum is also against charges as are the unions. Sue Corby, General Secretary of the First Division Association (for top civil servants) has pointed to the fact that charges mean fewer visitors and that when the GLC reduced fares in 1983 Science Museum attendance figures rose. Cuts have also meant that some museums are considering shutting on various days in the week. In a letter to *The Guardian*, one critic of charges said it was a question of access. The V & A, she said, had, over the last ten years, shut its

regional circulation services, closed on Fridays, closed many galleries for long periods and its catering was like British Rail's.[Amy Alexander, 1.11.85]

On the day the V & A introduced its voluntary charges (4.11.85) there was a picket of 50 including civil servants and the Opposition spokesman for the Arts, (Labour has pledged to rescind charges.) The picketers gave out 'No To Museum Charges' stickers and those who filed down one of the two admission aisles and paid at the cash till got a plain sticker. There is the question of principle, of liberality and the argument that admission charges are second charges, for museums are firstly provided from public money and therefore belong to the public. Another view put by a radio listener, is that we should *expect* to pay (cf Strong). There is, however, another stance which does not question the principle but feels unhappy at the amount. On the first day of voluntary charges, *The Guardian* interviewed an unemployed man who had travelled down from Stoke. He thought £2 excessive, but he was willing to contribute 30p. The V & A is not alone in shutting one day a week. The National Museum of Wales shuts on Mondays, as does the Welsh Industrial and Maritime Museum. Beamish, an 'independent' museum, is considering closing December to February, because of low attendance at that time. Despite this, however, there have been over 500 new museums created in the past 12 years and many have been quick to take advantage of money from the EEC, Tourist Boards, local business and voluntary and MSC labour.[David White, *New Society* 1985, p.279]

Hudson sees central and local funding as straitjackets since profits that should go to the museum in fact go to the treasurer's department and so forth.⁵¹ Out of about 2,000 museums in Britain, 1,500, says Hudson, are

public and "with rare exception the private museums charge and the public ones don't." [*Good Housekeeping*, June 1984, p.43] (Private, he defines as owned by individuals or charitable trusts. Public museums do, however, charge sometimes for special exhibitions.) For Hudson, charges for admission which private museums rely a great deal upon, mean "These museums *have* to be good to survive." Staff have their jobs at stake and attendance figures are, therefore, of paramount importance to them. Beamish, however, is well down on visitors in the winter, not due to its quality, but because the weather is cold and it is not the holiday season. Yet, it is economic pressure that is forcing this. Hudson goes on to point out that Norwich Castle, administered by the local authority, is professional and lively and asks: "... is it pure coincidence that Norwich is one of those which charges for admission?" his views agree with the Conservative faith in financial incentive and he goes as far as to advocate the short, sharp shock of market place reality for those public museums who are in a deep sleep. He also echoes Conservative calls and action for greater privatisation.⁵²

We have mentioned private sponsorship and there are some who worry that this will alter the content of museums, and that charging also would mean a museum would be ruled by the turnstile. Hamer and Wrobel state "that a museum dependent on income from a turnstile would find that the standards of its exhibitions had to drop, so as to compete with rivals such as the London Dungeon and Madame Tussauds." [*New Scientist*, p.21] Hudson, rather, says that it will make museums more "popular". Januszczak argues that taxpayers have a right to access to "our own heritage" [*The Guardian* 2.11.85] and says that three years ago the British Tourist Board

did a survey on museum charges. The findings were that the majority of visitors had the ability to pay as most were upper or middle class.

What we are seeing, however, are not simply arguments about whether museums are interesting to the general public or more educational or even democracy versus the scholar. It is a question of political belief or more fundamentally, one of morality, as defined at the beginning of this Chapter. There is a shift towards the morality of political economy, of market forces determining what is of use, and the question of need taking a back seat. Hudson's stance is curiously individualistic. In his 'A Social History of Museums' he saw that before public museums, entry was a privilege, later becoming a right. Now, he suggests that it will become even more of a right if we pay for it. "Give the decision to the consumer" is a Conservative Party argument with democracy as its flag and yet, as Hamer and Wrobel warn, we could end up in a situation where economic viability and business firms dictate what and how museums show. It cannot be denied that private museums need to charge, but for some it can accentuate their being tourist or "treat" centres rather than as ongoing centres of activity that people could enter and leave on numerous occasions. Many, however, have concessions for the unemployed with 'UB 40's' and museums are becoming seen as a part of a recreation, constructive leisure and informal, voluntary education framework for the unemployed. In the 19th Century, museums were advocated for their uses to industry and in weaning the working classes from drink. Today, as far as social policy is concerned, museums are part of a general attempt to keep the unemployed occupied and happy. A letter to *The Guardian* some years ago, asked for cheaper tickets for the unemployed to large London exhibitions. The cartoon alongside the letter showed a long queue outside

The Tate. Two city gents who were passing, commented: "They've either reduced the admission or there's a job vacancy for the attendant." Indeed, with unemployment (as a national average) running at between 13% - 14%, both the Tourist Board, the Government and the CBI see museums as creators of employment in themselves. It has been estimated that 1½ million are employed in tourist-related jobs (including hotels, caterers and suppliers). More than half are women and many are part-time, and seasonal (about half). Most of the work is in the South, but there are centres in the North.[R4 'Workface' 26.9.85] The reconstruction of Owen's New Lanark Mill's is based on MSC employment and the working museum of Styal boasts 50 such employees.

We must not forget, however, that a great many museums and art galleries, generally, present us with a particular view of the world and progress. This functions to shut off the future from any radical change. In my concluding remarks which follow I will re-state the issues raised above and attempt to demonstrate the ideas that link them together.

Notes

1. Corrigan, P. [1980a] from *Capital 111 Progress* Moscow, revised Ed. 1865, p.791. "It is always the direct relationship of the owners. If the conditions of production to the direct producers - a relation always naturally corresponding to a definite stage in the development of the methods of labour and thereby its social productivity - which reveals the innermost secret, the hidden basis of the entire social structure, and with it the political form of the relation of sovereignty and dependence, in short, the corresponding specific form of the state."
2. As the book cost two guineas it is small wonder the writer advocates a co-operative library.
3. He is one of the few witnesses who does not believe in the superiority of French design and believes that the mechanic classes generally have good taste - more than "the persons of Wapping but that the West End was more cultivated than Wapping.
4. There were student's days at the British Museum and National Gallery. James Crabbe a designer of fancy works for interior decoration said he visited the two places to study colour. [1835, p.450]
5. It is interesting to note that in 1855 when Ewart briefed Lord Stanley on getting the Public Libraries Bill through the Lords he "overdid it ... Lord Stanley became so convinced of the everyday importance of Public Libraries that he abandoned his original proposal to authorise a small charge for admission to them on one day each week and decided instead, as Ewart told Edwards, that "libraries existing, schools are not needed." (Munford, 1960, p141, n.5)
6. One witness, a silk manufacturer said French designs were better, but "our" colour was superior. [1835, p.411] Another said the French were better in design, chemistry *and* colour. Britain was thought overall to be way ahead in machine manufacture. These were still the views after 1851.
7. In 1843, there were six and a Normal School as part of the London School of Design. Between 1842 and 1852, 21 schools were set up:
Manchester 1842
Spitalfields & Female School (1842, London)
York 1842
Birmingham 1843
Sheffield 1843
Newcastle upon Tyne 1843

Glasgow 1844
 Nottingham 1844
 Nottingham 1844
 Coventry 1844
 Norwich 1845
 Leeds 1846
 Hanley/Stoke 1847 (joint schools)
 Paisley 1848
 Cork 1849
 Macclesfield 1850
 Belfast 1850
 Stourbridge 1851
 Worcester 1851
 St. Martin's (London) 1852
 Waterford 1852

Q. Bell describes the general pattern of how they were created. A local group which had an art school or a group of local VIP's who believed their town should have one, would hold a meeting, petition the Government and argue for the national importance of their district's manufactures, foreign competition etc. The petition would be referred to the Council at Somerset House and if favoured the town would receive (generally) £150 p.a. to pay a master it would appoint. The London Council also gave costs and advice and had rights of inspection. (For greater detail, see Quentin Bell, 1963, Chapter VII)

8. In Greece, "pinakotheke" was the term used for a picture gallery in the Propylaea in the Acropolis - Mordaunt-Crook, 1972, p19, Wittlin, 1949, p4)
9. Liverpool and Cardiff for example. Thomas Baines, [1871-77, p.537] mentions Yorkshire examples which also include Mechanic's Institutes and Literary and philosophical societies. In Kingston-upon-Hull, the Royal Literary Institution, founded May, 1853, "has a noble stone front in the Roman style of architecture, 160 feet long. The museum of the Philosophical Society of Scarborough housed its "series of geological specimens and other objects of natural history or local antiquity," in a circular building of Roman Doric and the Mechanics' Hall and Literary Institute had its "Grecian style of architecture with Doric and Ionic columns.
10. The lottery is mentioned in Cobbett's *Parliamentary History of England*, p.192, Vol XV 1753-65. A later debate about lotteries concentrated on the moral issues involved and there was criticism of malpractice in the 1753 lottery. Some agents had bought more tickets than allowed for the same individuals. It was initiated by proposal for a lottery for the sinking fund and one MP likened it to gambling which encouraged laxity for "all men naturally desire wealth, and most men are naturally averse from labour..." [Cobbett, Vol.XV, pp.513ff, 1755]
11. These included the then very popular Sebastiano del Piombo, 'The Rousing of Lazarus' which the *Penny Magazine* later described to its readers, Rubens 'Rape of the Sabines', five Claudes, a Titian, Hogarth's 'Marriage à la Mode', Wilkie's 'Village Festival' and

several paintings re-attributed in the following years. (See Boase 1959, p203)

12. There is an article on the Beaumonts by E.M. Howe, *History Today*, April 1974, pp.243ff, "Coal, Art and the Beaumonts". Early associated with midland collieries, the Beaumont family later became generous patrons of art. Sir George Beaumont's name, says Howe, is associated with the National Gallery, his name being on the frames of a Claude or Canaletto. These "he bought with the receipts from his Leicestershire mines..." [p.247]
13. In 1828, when the committee became a trust, there were three meetings, 1829 - no meetings, 1830 - two meetings, 1831 - one meeting, 1832 - one meeting, 1833 - two meetings.
(pp 1852-3, pp.3-4)
14. The list of trustees had risen to 15 by 1841. These were:
The Most Honourable Duke of Sutherland
The Most Honourable the Marquis of Lansdowne
The Most Honourable the Marquis of Northampton
Rt. Hon. Earl Grey, Rt. Hon. Lord Francis Egerton,
Rt. Hon. Earl of Ripon, Sir Martin Shee PRA,
Rt. Hon. Lord Ashburton, Rt. Hon. Lord Colbourne,
Rt. Hon. Lord Monteagle, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Peel,
Rt. Hon. Sir James Graham, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles Bagot,
Samuel Rogers Esq., and William Wells Esq.
Rep from the Select Committee on National Monuments and Works of Art, Brit Sess Papers 1841, Vol VI, Appx 2, p.627. See also D. Robertson *Sir Charles Eastlake and the Victorian Art World*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1978, pp.287-8 for a list of trustees 1824-1856.
Over half of these are mentioned and/or their collections of art described by Waagen in his *Art Treasures...* 1854, or by Passavant in his *Tour of a German Artist*, 1836 [from 1978 pub, Intro by C.J. Bailey]
Earl Grey - Waagen, Vol I, p.284
Lord Ashburton - Waagen, Vol II p.97
Lord Colborne - Waagen, Vol II p.240
Lord Francis Egerton - Passavant, Vol I p.122
Lord Francis Egerton - Passavant Vol II p.180
Also Samuel Rogers is mentioned in both, Sir Robert Peel, William Wells and Waagen also mentions Sir Charles Bagot.
15. Brotherton said that In Manchester £30,000 had already been raised and Peel himself had contributed £1,000 towards parks. A tax of ¼d in the £1 would provide a £50,000 building. His suggestion then would apply only to large towns and for the 3rd reading the bill proposed the measures only for towns of 10,000 or more inhabitants. Lady Simon notes how successful private suscription could be. Before the 1850 Libraries and Museums Act, which is printed as 1851 in Lady Simon's book, [p.279], the Mayor, Sir John Potter, had dinner at which the Subscription list was passed round "the table with the wine and was rapidly and liberally filled up". [From E. Edwards, *Freelending Libraries*, p.65] She notes how before any appeal was

made publicly, Potter had collected over £4,000. (See pp.274-283 for a history of Manchester's art galleries and libraries.)

16. Hayden committed suicide soon after. He had encouraged Ewart to set up Schools of Design and was for Government support. Lady Eastlake, however, writing of Art Unions said they were 'all very good and charitable' and 'modest merit' should be encouraged, but that people will only spend money on the best work. Government money, therefore, encouraged falsely as "Truth will out ... Journals and Correspondence, Vol.11 1843, February 13. p.50. As we shall see later, this is a view shared by the present Director of the Tate.
17. [p.184. Report from the Select Committee on National Monuments and Works of Art. British Sessional Papers. Vol.V1, p.615] J.E. Grey, Keeper of the Zoological collection at the British Museum said: "I am inclined to consider that the Museum is one of the greatest educational institutions of the country." - A view that has grown ever since.
18. Wyse had been M.P. for Waterford from a Catholic aristocratic family. Active in education policy he, it was who said: "*Give* what otherwise will be *taken*. By giving, you acquire the means and right of purifying, regulating, and directing, you become master of the new power, instead of the new power becoming yours. [Donajgrodzki, p.91. From Wyse's *Educational Reform: Or the Necessity of a National System of Education*. London 1836.]
19. He makes comparisons in many places. In Frankfort, for example, he says every town should form a museum like the one there.[p.367] In the Palace at Darmstadt, he admires the public lending library and advocates turning every town hall in England into a library where the books could be provided by inhabitants "above the rank of artisans." [p.388] He continues to advocate the principles laid down in his Bill of 1837.[p.389]
20. The whole collection also showed the manners and customs of Japan which Buckingham compares to a Mr. Dunn's London museum about China. [p.426]
21. Passavant, 1831, notes collections in Warwickshire at Warwick Castle and Berkswell Hall where M.P. Sir J.E. Eardley had "a small but choice collection of pictures." (1978, pp83-85)
22. Buckingham, [p.241], describes a Museum of Natural History in the Chateau at Popplendorf near Bonn which had 16,000 specimens. He says: "One room is fitted up as a marine grotto, with a variety of sea-shells, corals, and gypsum ... this was extremely good taste." He is impressed with the artistic display. [For more on the Natural History Museum, see W.T. Stearn, *The Natural History Museum*, ref. at S. Kensington, Heinemann.]
23. Back in 1850, the Liverpool Town Council had discussed setting up a museum and in 1851 a newsroom in Duke Street was bought to house both a museum and library. That year the 13th Earl of Derby gave

his zoological collection and a new site was funded by William Brown the local M.P. - opened in 1860.

24. Passavant describes Peel's collection as "one of the finest." [Vol.1, p.227] ¹⁹⁷⁸
25. In two instalments, 1804 and 1814 for £28,000. [See Mordaunt-Crook, p.67, Waagen Vol.1, p.49, where he notes the major purchases as 1805, the Townley collection for £20,000 and 1811 for £8,200. Passavant agrees it was 1805 - Vol.1, p.14.]
26. On 30.10.85 the British Government refused a UNESCO request for the Marbles to be returned to Greece. The British position is that they were "as a result of transactions conducted with the recognised legitimate authorities of the time." [A Government 'aide-memoire' quoted in *The Guardian*, 31.10.85.] Ten days before the decision there was a drama documentary on television, [Channel 4, 9.15 pm], called 'Lord Elgin and Some Stones of No Value' [in themselves.] This is a quote from a letter of Elgin's referring to the recovery of the Marbles from the ship 'The Mentor' which sank off Malta, 1802. Elgin had been Ambassador to Turkey in 1799. He had been urged before he left (by the architect, Thomas Harrison,) to employ artists to copy Greek designs for his house in Scotland. The British victory in Egypt facilitated Elgin's permit from the Turks to go onto the Acropolis to draw, mould, put up scaffolding and take away pieces. There is some dispute about this as 'pieces' could have meant 'loose' parts scattered around the site but were interpreted as the major sculptures. (A Caryatid which was removed and sent to the British Museum was found by the Greeks later to be of structural importance and they were charged £30,000 for a mould to be made.) Elgin was pleased when the marbles reached England for he felt they represented a complete picture of Athens. (The Marbles were eventually conveyed to England by the arrangements of Nelson.)
The Guardian [31.10.85], however, reported that a letter written by Elgin has just been brought to light which seems to "undermine the basis of Britain's refusal to return the Marbles ..." Discovered by Prof. Robert Browning, it was written in 1811 to Stanley Perceval, (then Prime Minister), and describes how Elgin denied he had Turkish help. It also states that Mr. Adair, Elgin's successor as Ambassador, tried to negotiate with the Turks for Elgin. He believed "the Porte (Ottoman Court) denied that the persons who had sold those marbles had any right to dispose of them." *The Guardian* also says that this quote was cut when A.H. Smith used it in 1916. In a recent interview the director of the British Museum, Sir David Wilson, said there was no longer the paranoia that had driven Panizzi to fortify the Museum in fear of Chartists in 1846. (The 250 special constables had orders to fire if the "mob" threw stones.) What Wilson does fear, however, is that the place may be sacked "internationally." [Terry Coleman 'Sir David, defender of the Marble halls.' *The Guardian* 14.12.85, p.17] He fears the "do-gooders who want to take everything away from us." He is sceptical about Neil Kinnock's promise to give the Elgin Marbles back to Greece, putting it down to the fact that it was given on his first trip abroad as leader of the Labour Party. He would also have a lot of trouble about it. Wilson adds: "Once you start destroying

this place you start destroying one of the great centres of culture. Everybody would then ask for things back, and where then would you have a universal institution of this sort? Nowhere in the world." He also believes that if the Museum had not taken care of the Elgin Marbles that they would be in pieces by now.

27. Ewart later joined the side trying to get Public Prosecutors. He was on the Select Committee 1854-5, on the Public Prosecutors Bill and another one on Public Prosecutors in 1856.
28. See a recent series of articles on tourism in *The Guardian* 12th - 15th August by Harold Jackson, "Why Money Changes in the Temple are a mixed blessing." [13.8.85] is about St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey. Also 27.7.85 about the Government's introduction of a new system of funding and the pressure on museums to charge for entry.
29. In 1835, 1836 and 1837 average figures were 6-7,000 taking £655 - £692 a year. The one shilling price meant the figure rose to 18,561. In 1841 when it was further reduced, to 6d, the figures for April alone were 8,115.
30. See Boase 1959, Steegman 1971, p.196 and D. Robertson, 1978, p.58ff. The Commission included Sir Francis Egerton, Samuel Rogers and the Historian, Macaulay. Robertson, [p.326], shows a portrait of all the members in 1846. By John Partridge, it is in the National Portrait Gallery.
31. The Sheepshank's collection had been given to the National Gallery on condition that it was open on Sunday afternoon 'so soon as arrangements can properly be made.' The Sunday Lecture League and The Sunday Society extended influences in the provinces during the 1870's and wanted provincial museums opened as a prelude to national ones. By the late '70's too there was more religious support for opening the British Museum on Sunday afternoon. The British Museum, the National Gallery and S. Kensington eventually opened on Sundays. Wigley 1980 p129 & Wilkenson 1980 p110 describes the Sunday opening of Manchester Library in 1878 and Stoke reading room and museum in 1881. The latter opened with Volunteer labour but it was found that working class people still did not use the library. (See also J. & B. Hammond, 1945, pp64-67)
32. This request was partly due to the fact that S. Kensington charged the public on student days and the trustees at Trafalgar Square thought this would put people off seeing their works.
33. At S. Kensington, there were two free evenings and one for students. From June 1857, to the end of the year, 138,802 came in the evenings not including student days and 100,633 in free mornings. On student days the figures were lower - this was obviously due mostly to the fact that there was a charge on these days.
34. Working women with children are not mentioned but they would have even less leisure time than the man. As in 1835, it is assumed that those who would go to Government Schools and benefit industry

through museums, are lads. The time best for working class people is also discussed in terms of male workers and the time available away from work. The committee, however, expresses pleasure that hours of work are shortening and ½ day Saturdays are being introduced. It says that most working men finish work before seven and evenings are for working men's colleges and the time "the wives are mostly in the habit of going out with their husbands." [p.4]

35. The Select Committee on Works of Art in 1848 (including Peel, Hume, Lord John Russell and Disraeli) considered providing extra room for paintings at the National Gallery especially since acquiring Vernon's paintings. It thought the Trafalgar Square site a "commanding national site" but that the present facility lacked the dignity and elevation to match. By the 1850's the site was seen as permanent due to its being central and accessible (even if the smoke damaged paintings) and that more working class people would go at this site. Though Waagen in the early part of the decade thought a newer and larger building was necessary for space and because of "the smokey atmosphere of Charing Cross, the pictures incur such damage that their ultimate ruin in the locality is inevitable." [Vol.1, p.318]
35. There is an amusing story how Elizabeth Rigby went to see Turner. She found his gallery, "fine", but "dilapidated." One painting "with all the elements in an uproar, of which I incautiously said 'the 'End of the World' Mr. Turner?' " "No, Ma'm, Hannibal Crossing the Alps." She was shown many of his works and found him living in "penury and meanness." [Lady Eastlake, *Journals and Correspondance* Vol.1, p.188. 20.5.46]
36. Another example was Waagen's examination of Lord Ashburton's collections which had been inherited from his father and described by Passavant, [Vol.1, p.227] as "very choice". Waagen described Ashburton as a philanthropic and amiable man of that class "who have a real pleasure in allowing others to enjoy their treasures of art; and a luncheon of which I partook in his mansion, in company with an interesting party, forms one of the numerous agreeable recollections appertaining to my visit to London in the year 1851. Among the illustrious individuals with whom I lingered admiringly before these chefs-d'oeuvre, was the celebrated Macaulay, an author whose works are highly esteemed in Germany." [Vol.11, pp.97-98]
37. It was originally set up as a support for a limited number of poor in the 17th century. Passavant criticises its opulence and says its aims had been sacrificed for this. Waagen noted its inmates were "comfortable." According to Passavant, the pictures, (French, Spanish, Dutch, Italian and English), were donated by Sir Francis Bourgeois "a gentleman of great taste and wealth, [Passavant, Vol.1, p.61] who had wanted them to be the foundation of a National Gallery if a suitable building was provided. But "being frustrated in this public-spirited plan" he gave them to the College where they were housed in "a fine gallery" designed by Mr. John Soane, (later Sir John.) Waagen liked the lighting (from above) but criticised the collection for inaccuracies, saying, "In none of the galleries which I have hitherto

seen in England do the pictures agree so little with the names given to them ..." (Waagen, 1854, Vol II, p342)

38. When Waagen called to see the collection of the Duke of Devonshire at Devonshire House, the Duke was not there, so Waagen left his letters from Princess Louisa and Prince Charles of Prussia. The next day, Waagen "received a polite note from the Duke, in which he invited me to call on him the following day. He received me with great kindness, and conducted me himself about his mansion." [Vol.11, p.88] Passavant, earlier, had inspected the Duke's art works at Chatsworth and the Duke himself gave him a written permission. Waagen described the Duke's collections as based on one of the great 18th Century cabinets and was also shown engraved gems, 564 medals and a book of Claude Lorraine's drawings, (*Liber Veritatis*.)
39. Some voices were raised against the love affair with Italy. One example is noted by Steegman who quotes from a letter Dickens sent in 1845 from Italy. He described the professional models hanging about the steps of the Trinita de'Monti and wrote: "I would not conceive how their faces were familiar to me, how they seemed to have bored me for many years ... " He noticed various archetypes; The Assassin, The Haughty, The Venerable Patriarch, The Pastoral, etc. [p.160. See also *The Victorian Vision of Italy*, Leicester Museum and Art Gallery, 1968, p.8, for other examples.]
40. There has been the recent opening, (October '85), of the Treasure Houses of Great Britain Exhibition in Washington. Its importance, signified by the aristocratic milieu at the opening dinner, which included politicians such as Weinburger, will be highlighted when Prince Charles and Princess Diana visit soon. It was arranged by Gervase Jackson-Stops, an adviser to the National Trust, "who has crated off more than 700 items to Washington", [*The Guardian* 26.10.85]. Apparently, says *The Guardian*, he posed as a paying member of the public. His description of his difficulties (and the willingness of the artistocracy to loan objects) could perhaps, be compared with Passavant's and Waagen's problems. He cased the stately homes using camera and tape measure. At one place, he was discovered and the film confiscated and at another house, when he and exhibition designers decided to take a walk, they were shot at, (he says it was not deliberate.) People were pleased to lend objects, (the Ford Company is paying for most of the exhibition expenses.) The exhibition shows the development of the country house and has tried to create 'authentic' settings, for example, sand in the paint to create a 'stone' effect. Its objects consist of many items from grand tours and Jackson-Stops describes the exhibition as a celebration of 'our' assets. One of the American organisers tried to explain the Anglophilia as a yearning for the old and called it "a kind of Disneyland thing."
41. John Berger relates how the high monetary value placed on da Vinci's cartoon *The Virgin Child with St. Anne and St. John the Baptist* in the National Gallery affected the way it was placed in the Gallery. After an American offered £2½ million it was placed in a "room like a chapel".[1979, p.23] This would tend to contradict Reitlinger's

statement that when a highly priced painting is put in a museum "the price is forgotten." [Reitlinger, p.266] In the 19th Century, if a painting was re-attributed, like the Giorgione, this affected its place in the museum. [Robertson, 1978 p.133. And for other re-attributions, pp.136-7, Chapter VIII]

42. Peel's verdict on 'early' Italian art, as we saw, was that they were 'curiosities' and although he professed sympathy with Ewart's Museum Bill, he was opposed to local levying of money for it. Bearing in mind, also, that Eastlake said Peel was influential and that the National Gallery did not start buying (although it accepted two as gifts in 1848) art from the 13th and 14th centuries until the 1850's perhaps the politician prevented these sort of acquisitions. The decision to buy them, later, was, however, linked to educational aims.

(1971)

43. This sort of overcrowding, says Grana, is shown in engravings of The Louvre and McKenzie's painting of the National Gallery, in 1820. [sic - 1824]. The common feature is the way the walls are nearly totally covered to give them the look of a storehouse or counting-room. Grana notes that this has since gradually been ended due to an emphasis on the artist, one-man-shows, to the display of paintings in isolation in "aesthetic chapels." [p.100] The picture of Mayer's Egyptian Museum in Liverpool. [Warburton and Nicholson, 1984, p.7 & p.9] and of the British Museum's Natural History Department show a similar crowding.
44. Ruskin later opened a museum. In 1875 he bought some land and the idea was to form a society to practise his beliefs which would, he hoped, spread. Members were to do agricultural work and educate each other. Landlords were to live on the same land as their tenants and manufacturers work in their factories and share profits. Machines were to be used at a minimum. He contributed to a fund (one tenth of his earnings) and it was called the St. George's Guild. He appointed himself Master of the Guild and envisaged schools too, but numbers of participants were small, [See J. Abse, p.240ff] and by the 1880's it was not thriving. [p.329] In 1875, Ruskin had been offered space in Sheffield's new public museum but he wished to keep it separate as he did not approve of the way most museums displayed objects. He wished "to show how art evolved out of nature ... [which] we now called 'inter-disciplinary presentation'". [Bill Silvester, 'The Genesis of a Labouring Museum', *Historical Workshop* Vol.32, No.2, May '84, p.161] It later went to the public museum.
45. When asked if there was space for more pictures Twaites said that there was not, in the best positions, but they had been putting them in a hall under the building which "if thought desirable" could be opened to the public. They had three large and two small rooms and allowed 700-800 in at a time.[1841, p.583]
46. In 1843, Eastlake had abridged the catalogue of the exhibition of cartoons to a 1d size, but he said, "Many of the most wretchedly dressed people preferred the six-penny one with the quotation ..." [Quoted in D. Robertson, p.65] Robertson also reproduces a *Punch*

cartoon by John Leech, 15.7.43, of a series of six. No 1, shown here, shows a free day at Westminster Hall. It shows groups of ragged and disabled poor, looking at paintings of aristocrats, pets on satin chairs and still life of fruit etc.

47. The Tate has, however, had exhibitions for the visually disabled and also tried to encourage children with its 'Stop and Look' guides which ask questions about form and mood. The National Gallery too, has tried to provoke thought about its paintings in its attempts to attract school parties. The approach is not art-historical, for if a child was present with a work sheet called "Creepy Crawlies" or "Dutch Painting in the 17th Century" says Anthea Peppin, Education Officer, it will choose the former. She adds: "As many major art works are now in public ownership, their future preservation will depend upon their appreciation by the next generation. It is due to this support from the Director that the National Gallery education programme has developed so rapidly in the last few years, and the recent policy of encouraging children to come to the Gallery has been implemented. Bored children soon become a nuisance and so it is the job of the Education Department to make sure that children in the Gallery are kept as busy as possible for the duration of their visit - either by means of an informal lecture in front of a few paintings or by the issue and completion of a quiz or worksheet." [Anthea Peppin, *Oxford Art Journal*, No. 3, Art and Education, p.25] There is not an art-historical approach and the emphasis is on individual response.
48. This idea of objectivity denies to a large extent, that someone like Bowness exercises bias in his choices. Hockney accused Reid of favouritism towards abstraction but there is also the question of the acceptance, without question, (itself a bias, albeit unacknowledged) of the view that the art-historical map of great art is that produced by one sex and consisting mainly of that same sex. It also side-steps the issue of meaning in works of art. A feminist art-critic would have a different interpretation of an Allen Jones from that of Bowness, for example.
49. Did "cave-men"[sic] live underground? It is interesting to see that, apart from the ex-miner volunteers who guide the tours, that, in common with other museums, it benefits from MSC funded staff. Also, because Wolstanton, (a local pit) is closing, there are fears that Chatterly Whitfield may be flooded.
50. Attendance figures published in its 1st report in 1978:

	000's
1971	50
1972	80
1973	117
1974	144
1975	165
1976	217

The popular month was August and an English Tourist Board Survey in 1975, showed that in July and August, 60% of the visitors were tourists.

51. Hudson gives an example of one museum getting around this: "A few years ago Shropshire County Council's Acton Scott Working Farm Museum won a £1000 prize in the annual Museum of the Year competition. Knowing that the museum would never see the £1000, except as a cheque at the presentation ceremony, the astute head of the county museum service opted for a Shire horse instead ... [*Good Housekeeping* June 1984, p.43]
52. Greater privatisation does not always lead to greater efficiency. It can, of course, cut down on public spending, but often also cuts down on quality. This has been found to be true in the Health Service where the laundry, for example, was put into the hands of private firms who are apt to cut corners.

CONCLUSION.

Some Conclusions

The following are some brief concluding remarks.

In the Introduction, the question was asked about whether leisure and topics such as museums were nothing but a "footnote [to] our understanding of the 19th Century?" [Cunningham, 1980, p.11]. As the reader has seen, I have found it impossible to discuss museums 'in vacuo' from the state and the social relations inherent in capitalist production. Many instances have been given throughout the chapters, of these connections, including class, charity, education, St. Monday, the select committees of 1835 and 1836, the Schools of Design, The Great Exhibition and others. In the last chapter, it was shown that the relationship between museums and work became explicit in the evidence of the 1835 committee along with ideas of industrial competition and civilisation. These arguments were also used in the parliamentary debates in 1845. The issue of time (i.e. relating to work and to museums' accessibility to working class people), was most debated in the 1860's *after* the principle of public museums had been established and some local towns and cities had approved their actual creation. Although, as we have seen, some working class men complained about lack of accessibility to museums, (including attempts such as Lovett's in the 1840's), the Municipal provision of such items, was not:

some irresistible pressure from below which led to the establishment of a library, museum and art gallery ... On the contrary, the pressure

came from the elites for whom this public provision was an enterprise in bringing civilisation to the people,'
[Cunningham, 1980, p,155]

There were also efforts of individuals such as Mayer in Liverpool and local societies and some whose collections became the main body of a local museum. I discussed (in the Introduction), Gramsci's concept of hegemony and in connection with the State, he says the latter *cements* the power bloc of a particular fraction or class. The power made available to local governments enabled this to happen with local museums. It is interesting to note that State bodies (select committees, Parliament, The Treasury and so on) provided the arena for many of the debates on the topics mentioned at the beginning of this last section. These included not only debates leading to decisions on enabling powers to local areas, but also on the London museums (See Chapter 5) and other monuments, (for example, The Tower of London, Hampton Court, etc). The Treasury could, for example, approve or deny money for National Gallery purchases and wages and the Prime Minister could influence appointments. We saw how Peel presided to a certain extent over Eastlake's career and how ideas about art, and more generally, civilisation, could be shared between individuals one may expect to differ. This was further amplified by the use of such experts as art historians, artists, museum personnel, travellers etc., as witnesses at the select committees we described in Chapter 5. Many of the ideas expressed about the development of art, 'primitive' art and class, show a coherency which is more striking than any disparity. Playfair, with his scientific background and many of the business aristocratic and royal personnel involved with the Great Exhibition, exhibit similar ideas about progress and civilisation as we later saw in the Parliamentary

debates on museums and the views of art historians etc. Ideas and feelings of superiority were also expressed in the popular literature, (for example, cartoons), of the Great Exhibition, the rhetoric surrounding it and the fear of the 'bearded foreigner' who was supposed to be about to overrun London in 1851. There were also some fears (about the threat from within) that the working classes may run amok and many views were expressed about working class reaction and leisure. Some, including Prince Albert, are shown, in the last analysis, to have discounted these fears of insurrection. Indeed, as we saw at the 1841 Select Committee on public monuments, a relatively large number of questions were devoted to working class behaviour and most witnesses said that it was very good. Richard Johnson, as we have noted, (Introduction), believes that the growth of the State led to alliances against any working class threat such as Chartism. Perhaps, therefore, it is no accident that the 1841 select committee should concentrate so much on behaviour. In 1851, trust was seen to have been shown in 'the people' but, as Elias has pointed out, the civilising power of a centralising State relies more and more on a real physical power which is kept hidden or in apparent restraint, as far as is possible. On the day of the Chartist Petition, people like Playfair, (who did not, however, take it seriously) were sworn in as special constables and in 1851 troops were in readiness for the opening ceremony in the case of riot but, they were not to be visible as Wellington thought it would incite trouble. (There were troops outside the British Museum, however, as the risk here was thought too great). There had also been, as we saw in Chapter 2, attempts to civilise other areas of working class leisure and this had, in the case of the music halls, been recognised as sound economic sense. We also saw, (and in Chapter 3), that some working

class people recognised (for example, on the issue of drink), that there were advantages to 'civilising' behaviour. This highlights sexual divisions in the internalisation of standards of behaviour. (See Chapter 3)

I hope I have shown that civilisation and progress were linked to ideas of industrial competition and behaviour. In Chapter 3, it was shown how comparisons were made between English culture and other cultures considered 'primitive'. In Europe comparisons were urged in order to ascertain the economic pecking order and vindicate ideas of a free market economy. Feelings of superiority over other races existed prior to this, but as pointed out in Chapter 3, this was comparatively muted. In the mid-19th Century, these comparisons were being made in a more quantifiable way, (for example, The Great Exhibition). The Great Exhibition proved industrial muscle and embodied ideas on civilisation. Pronouncements could be made about working class behaviour seen as better than expected, different and humorous. We saw also in Chapter 5, how the issue of damage to works of art etc., encapsulated ideas of civilised behaviour, of 'primitive' peoples and the working class. Protection of 'priceless' property justified the salvation of the Elgin Marbles and the harsh sentences under the 1845 Act.

Undoubtedly, (Chapter 5), museums were considered as centres of civilisation (we also discussed their architecture), and we discussed *The Penny Magazine's* attempts to interest the worker in this. I hope I have shown that the State and industrial capital have a much more direct relationship with museums than is generally believed. Bearing in mind the opening sections of Chapter 5, in which the social relations of capitalist production were seen as enmeshed in the dominant morality of the latter,

I leave the final quote to Philip Corrigan. He talks about State forms seeming to have a natural civilised status "above society" and adds:

Although the State regulates capitalist production relations, acting consistently in favour of vanguard production forms and 'national' capitalist interests, its rule is founded upon two prior systems of ritual and category; a wider moral classification which grades the phenomenally separate individuals through certain, often legally defined, forms, and secondly, the dull and repeated obviousness of the way things can be made in *that* mode of production. That the latter (whose natural obviousness underpins the moral classification) is now the only way to do things, results from a long and bloody struggle to deny the validity of alternatives ... Socialist understanding of the State, a stage before any transformations are possible - has come to terms with this very broad canvas of social experience.
[1980a, p.19]

I hope that this thesis has, to some small degree, contributed to this.

(place of publication is London except where stated)

- Abse, J., 1980, **John Ruskin; the Passionate Moralist**, Quartet.
- Allwood, J., 1977, **The Great Exhibitions**, Studio Vista.
- Altick, R.D., 1957, **The Common Reader**, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Altick, R.D., 1978, **The Shows of London**, Belknap, Cambridge, Mass.
- Ames, W., 1967, **Prince Albert and Victorian Taste**, Chapman and Hall.
- Art Journal, The., (1851), 1970, **Illustrated Catalogue of the Industry of All Nations**, David & Charles, Newton Abbot.
- Babbage, W., (1851), 1968, **The Exposition of 1851**, Frank Cass & Co Ltd.
- Bagehot, W., 1885, **The Postulates of English Political Economy**, Longman, Green & Co.
- Bailey, P., 1978, **Leisure and Class in Victorian England; rational recreation and the contest for control**, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bailey, P., 1977, 'A Mingled Mass of Perfectly Legitimate Pleasures': **The Victorian Middle Class and the Problem of Leisure**, Victorian Studies, Autumn, Vol XXI, No. 1, 7-28.
- Baines. T., 1871-77, **Yorkshire, past and present; a history and description of the three Ridings of the great county of York, from the earliest ages to the year 1870. With an account of its manufactures, commerce, and civil and mechanical engineering... Including an account of the woollen trade of Yorkshire**, 2 Vols, Mackenzie.
- Bamford, S., 1893, **Passages in the Life of a Radical and Early Days**, (Introduction by H. Dunkley), T. Fisher Unwin.
- Baranik et al., 1977, **an anti-catalog**, The Catalog Committee of Artists Meeting for Cultural Change, New York.
- Barber, R., 21.9.85 & 19.1.85, Editorials on Royalty in Woman magazine.

- Barthes, R., 1976, **Mythologies**, Paladin, St. Albans.
- Beamish, Joint Committee of 1978., **North of England Open Air Museum**, Spring, Co.Durham.
- Beard, C., (1901), 1936, **The Industrial Revolution**, Allen & Unwin.
- Beaver, P., 1970, **The Crystal Palace**, Evelyn.
- Bell, Q., 1963, **The Schools of Design**, Routledge, Kegan,Paul.
- Bell, S.P., Ed., 1974, **Victorian Lancashire**, David & Clarke, Newton Abbot.
- Bennett, D., 1977, **King Without a Crown, Prince Consort of England 1819-1861**, Heinemann.
- Berger, J., 1979, **Ways of Seeing**. BBC and Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Blackwood, B., 1974, **Pitt Rivers**, Natural History Museum, Oxford.
- Boase, T.S.R., 1959, **English Art: 1800-1970**, Clarendon, Oxford.
- Bourdieu, P., & Darbel, A., 1966, **L'Amour de L'Art; les musees et leur publique**, Editions de Minuit, Paris.
- Bradford, Earl of, 1985, "We never tell visitors we don't live at Weston", in **Sunday Times Magazine** 24th Feb.
- Briggs, A., 1956, "Middle Class consciousness in English Politics 1780-1846" in **Past and Present**, 65-74.
- Briggs, A., 1968 'The Victorian City: Quantity and Quality', **Victorian Studies**, Summer.
- Buckingham, J.S., (no date), **Belgium, the Rhine, Switzerland, Holland; An Autumn Tour**, Vol 1, Jackson.
- Burns, G., 1984, 'The Most Influential Man in British Art' in **The Observer**, 15th June.
- Burrow, J.W., 1966, **Evolution and Society**, Cambridge University Press.
- Bury, J.B., 1966, **The Idea of Progress**, Macmillan.
- Campbell, B., 1984, **Wigan Pier Revisited**, Virago.
- Campbell, G.A., 1965, **The Civil Service in Britain**, Duckworth.
- Cannon-Brookes, P., 1981, 'Museums. a Bad Case of Rot', in **The Guardian**, 27th April.

- Carswell, J., 1966, **The Civil Servant and His World**, Gollancz.
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, 1976, **Working Papers in Cultural Studies**, Centre for C.C.S., No.9 Spring, Birmingham.
- Chadwick, E., Ed., M.W.Flinn, 1963. **Report on the Sanitary Conditions of the Labouring Population of Great Britain**, First published 1842 Vol 26 House of Lords Sessional Papers, Edinburgh University Press.
- Chancellor, V.E., Ed., 1969, **Master and Artisan in Victorian England. The Diary of William Andrews and the Autobiography of Joseph Gutteridge**, Evelyn Adams & Mackay.
- Chandler, G., 1957, **Liverpool**, Batsford.
- Cheshire, D.F., 1974, **Music Hall in Britain**, David & Charles, Newton Abbot.
- Clarke, J., & Johnson, R., Eds., 1979, **Working Class Culture**, Hutchinson, Birmingham.
- Coles & Postgates, 1966, **The Common People**, Methuen.
- Cork, R., 1979, 'Extending the Tate into Society, **Art Monthly**, 16th June.
- Corrigan, P., 1980a, **Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist theory; historical investigations**, Quartet.
- Corrigan, P., 1980b, 'Curiouser and Curiouser; a largely biographical comment on Hall's English Intelligentsia', in **British Journal of Sociology**, Vol 31, No 2, 292-7 June.
- Crowther, J.G., 1965, **The Statesmen of Science**, Cresset.
- Cunningham, H., 1980, **Leisure in the Industrial Revolution**, Croom Helm, Newton Abbot.
- D.E.S., 1973, **Standing Committee on Provincial Museums and Art Galleries**, H.M.S.O.
- Donajgrodzki, A.P., Ed., 1977, **Social Control in Nineteenth Century Britain**, Croom Helm, Newton Abbot.
- Duncan, C., & Wallach, A., 1980, 'The Universal Survey Museum' in **Art History**, Vol 3, 440, Dec.
- Dunning, E.G., 1963, 'Football in its early stages', in **History Today**, 838-47, Dec.

- Eastlake, E, Ed., Smith, C., 1895, **Journals and Correspondence of Lady Eastlake**, 2 Vols. Murray.
- d'Eichthal, G., 1977, **A French Sociologist looks at Britain in 1882**, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Elias, N., 1978-82, **The Civilizing Process**, 2 Vols., Blackwell, Oxford.
- Eliot, G., (1866), 1978, Felix Holt, Pan.
- Eliot, G., **Scenes of Clerical Life**, (1858), 1980, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Engels, F., (1845), 1969, **The Condition of the Working Class in England**, Panther.
- Escott, T.H.S., 1885, **England, Its People, Polity and Pursuits**, Chapman and Hall.
- Eyck, F., 1959, **The Prince Consort; A Political Biography**, Chatto & Windus.
- Faucett, T., 1974, **The Rise of English Provincial Art; Artists, Patrons and Institutions Outside London 1800-1830**, Clarendon, Oxford.
- Fay, C.R., 1951, **Palace of Industry 1851**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Felstead., S.T., 1947, **Stars Who Made the Halls**, Hutchinson.
- Fletcher, G.S., 1962, **Popular Art in England**, George G. Harrap.
- Ford, C., & Harrison, B., 1983, **A Hundred years Ago; Britain in the 1880's in words and Photographs**, Allen Lane.
- Foreman, A., 1977, **Femininity as Alienation; Women and the Family in Marxism and Psychoanalysis**, Pluto.
- Foster, J., 1974, **Industrialisation and the Class Struggle; Early Industrial Capitalism in Three English towns**, Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Francis, Sir F., 1971, **Treasures of the British Museum**, Thames & Hudson.
- Fraser, D., (1973), 1976, **The Evolution of the Welfare State**, Macmillan.

- Gaskell, E., (1848), 1979, **Mary Burton**, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Gibbs-Smith, C.H., 1964, **The Great Exhibition of 1851; A Commemorative Album**, H.M.S.O.
- Girouard, M., 1975, **Victorian Pubs**, Studio Vista.
- Grana, C., 1971, **Fact and Symbol**, OUP, New York.
- de Grazia, S., 1962, **Of Time, Work, and Leisure**, The Twentieth Century Fund, New York.
- Hamer, M., & Wrobell, P., 1985, 'Museum Charges', **New Scientist**, No.1471, 20, 29th August.
- Hammond, J.L., & H.B., (1917), 1978, **The Town Labourer**, Longmans.
- Hammond, J.L., & H.B., (1923), 1939, **Lord Shaftsbury**, Pelican, Harmondsworth.
- Hammond, J.L. & H.B., (1934), 1945, **The Bleak Age**, Longmans Green & Co.
- Harrie C., & Martin, G., & Scharf, A., 1970, **Industrialisation and Culture 1830-1914**, An Open University Press book, Macmillan.
- Harrison, B., 1971, **Drink and the Victorians; the temperance question in England 1815-1872**, Faber & Faber.
- Harrison, J.F.C., 1961, **Learning and Living 1790-1960; a study in the history of the English adult education movement**, Routledge.
- Hearn F., 1978, **Domination, Legitimation, and Resistance, The Incorporation of the 19th Century Working Class**, Greenwood Press, Connecticut.
- Higgs, E., 1983, 'Leisure and State: The History of Popular Culture as Reflected in the Public Records', **History Workshop Journal**, No.15, 141, Spring.
- Hobhouse, C., (1937), 1950, **1851 and the Crystal Palace**, Murray.
- Hobsbawn, E., 1968, **Labouring Men; studies in the history of labour**, Weidenfeld.
- Hobsbawn, E., (1968), 1979, **Industry and Empire**, Vol 3, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

- Hoggart, R., 1971, **The Uses of Literacy**, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Hole, Dean, 1893, **The Memories of Dean Hole**, Arnold.
- Hopkins, E., 1979, **A Social History of the English Working Classes 1815-1945**, Arnold.
- Horne, D., 1984, **The Great Museum**, Pluto.
- Howe, E.M., 1974, **Coal, Art and the Beamonts**, History Today, 243, April.
- Hudson, K., 1975, **A Social History of Museums**, Macmillan.
- Hudson, K., 1984, **Museum Charges are good for the Paying Public**, Good Housekeeping, 43 June.
- Hudson, K., 1985, 'Packaging the Past', in **New Society** Vol 72, No.1169, 270.
- Jackson, B., 1972, **Working Class Community**, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Jackson, M., 1976, **The English Pub**, Collins.
- Jacob, A., 1972, 'Rayards of British India', in **History Today**, Vol XXII, No.1, Jan., 63.
- Januszczak, W., 1984, 'Has Modernism died so that Art can live again?', in **The Guardian**, 22nd Aug.
- Johnstone, W., 1851, **England as it is, politics, society and industry in the middle of the nineteenth century**, 2 Vols., Murray.
- Joll, J., 1977, **Gramsci**, Fontana, Glasgow.
- Klingender, F.D., 1975, **Art and the Industrial Revolution**, Paladin, St. Albans.
- Leicester Museum & Art Gallery, 1968, **The Victorian Vision of Italy 1825-1875**, Leicester Museums & Art Gallery, Leicester.
- Llewelyn Davies, M., 1978, **Maternity. Letters from Working Women**, Virago.
- Lorrimer, D.A., 1977, **Colour, Class and the Victorian attitudes to the Negro in the mid-nineteenth century**, Leicester Univ.Press, Bradford-on-Avon.
- Lovett, W., 1920, **Life and Struggles of William Lovett in his pursuit of bread, knowledge and freedom**, 2 Vols., Bohn's Popular Library.

- Lowerson, J., & Myercough, J., 1977, **Time to Spare in Victorian England**, Harvester, Sussex.
- MacCrae, D., 1961, **Ideology and Society; papers in sociology and politics**, Heinemann.
- Macaulay, T.B., 1902, **Essays and Lays of Ancient Rome**, Longmans, Green & Co.,
- Maidment, B.E., 1984, 'Magazines of Popular Progress and the Artisans', in **Victorian Periodicals**, Vol.XVII, 83-94.
- Malcolmson, R.W., 1973, **Popular Recreation in English Society 1700-1850**, Cambridge Univ.Press, Cambridge.
- Malraux, A., 1952-4-6, **La Musee Imaginaire**, 3 Vols, Gallimard, Paris.
- Manders, R., & Mitcheson, J., 1974, **British Music Hall**, Gentry Books.
- Marcuse, H., 1968, **One Dimensional Man**, Sphere Books.
- Mare, E du., 1973, **London 1851 - The Year of the Great Exhibition**, Dent.
- Marx, K., 1975, **Early Writings of Marx**, (intro. by L. Colletti), Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Marx, K., 1976, **Wage, Labour and Capital**, Progress Publishers, Moscow.
- Mayhew, H., & Cruikshank, G., (no date), **1851, Or the Adventures of Mr and Mrs. Sandboys & Family who came to London to see the Great Exhibition**, Bogue.
- Mordaunt-Crook, J., **The British Museum**, Allen Lane.
- Munford, W.A., 1960, **William Ewart MP 1798-1869, Portrait of a Radical**, Grafton & Co.
- Musgrave, P.W., 1976, **Society and Education in England since 1800**, Methuen.
- Neale, R.S., 1972, **Class and Ideology in the Nineteenth Century**, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Nicholson, S., & Warhurst, M., 1982, **Joseph Mayer 1803-86**, Liverpool County Museums, Liverpool.
- Observer Magazine**, 1980, 'The Great Museums Guide', II parts.
- Ollman, B., 1977, **Alienation;; Marx's Conception of Man in Capitalist Society**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.

- Opperman, T.H., 1931, **The Thorwaldsen Museum Illustrated Official Guide**, Jogensen, Copenhagen.
- Parris, H., 1969, **Origins of the Permanent Civil Servant in Public Administration, 1730-1830**, Allen & Unwin.
- Passavant, J.D., (1836), 1978, **Tour of a German Artist in England**, (Intro. by C.J. Bailey), 2 Vols, E.P. Publishing Ltd., Wakefield.
- Pearsall, R., 1975, **Edwardian Popular Music**, David & Clarke, Newton Abbott.
- Peppin, A., 'Worse than Church? Children at the National Gallery' in **Oxford Art Journal**, No.3.
- Picton, J.A. 1886, **Liverpool Municipal Records. From AD 1700 to the Passing of the Municipal Reform Act 1835**, Walmsley, Liverpool.
- Plon, E., 1874, **Thorwalsen: His Life and Works**, Bentley.
- Price, R.N., 1971, 'The Working Men's Club Movement and Victorian Social Reform Ideology', in **Victorian Studies**, Vol.XV, No.2, Dec., 117-147.
- Reid, D.A., 1976, 'The Decline of St Monday 1766-1876', in **Past & Present**, No.71, 76-101.
- Reid, W., 1900, **Memoirs and Correspondence of Lord Playfair**, Cassell.
- Reitlinger, G.R., 1961-70, **The Economics of Taste**, 3 Vols., Barrie & Jenkins.
- Richards, P.G., 1975, **The Reformed Local Government System**, Allen & Unwin.
- Ripley, D., 1970, **The Sacred Grove**, Gollancz.
- Roberts, D., 1968, **Victorian Origins of the British Welfare State**, Yale Univ.Press, Newhaven.
- Robertson, D.A., 1978, **Sir Charles Eastlake and the Victorian Art World**, Princetown Univ.Press, Princetown.
- Rubinstein, W.D., 1977, 'Wealth, Elites and Class Structure in Britain' in **Past & Present**, No.76, 99-126.
- Ruskin, J., 1906, **Sesames and Lillies**, George Allen.

- Savage, G., 1969, **The Market in Art**, Occas.Papers, Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Scott, H., 1946, **The Early Doors**, Origins of the Music Hall, Nicholson & Watson.
- Seling, G., 1967, 'The Genesis of the Museum', in Architectural Review, Feb.
- Shaw, C., 1983, **When I was a Child**, Caliban.
- Short, A., 1966, 'Workers Under Glass in 1851', in **Victorian Studies**, Vol.X, No.2, 193-298.
- Sillitoe, A., 1958, **Saturday Night, Sunday Morning**, Allen.
- Silvester, B., 1984, 'The Genesis of a Labouring Museum', in **History Workshop**, Vol.32, No.2.161.
- Simon, Lady, 1938, **A century of British Government 1838-1938**, George Allen & Unwin.
- Smith, D., 1982, **Conflict and Compromise;Class formation in English society, 1830-1904. A Comparative Study of Birmingham and Sheffield**, Routledge.
- Spiller, B., 1972, **Victorian Public Houses**, David & Clarke, Newton Abbot.
- Starsmore, I., 1975, **English Fairs**, Thames & Hudson.
- Stedman-Jones, G., 1983, **Languages of Class**, Cambridge Univ.Press, Cambridge.
- Steezman, J., 1971, **Victorian Taste**, M.I.T. Cambridge, Mass. (Originally pub. as 'Consort of Taste' 1830-1870, in 1950)
- Sudjic, D., 1984, 'Tycoon with designs on the Tate', in **Sunday Times Magazine**, 29 April.
- Sutherland, G., (Ed.), 1972, **Studies in the Growth of Nineteenth Century Government**, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Swingewood, A., 1977, **The Myth of Mass Culture**, Macmillan.
- Thane, P. 1975, 'Review of E.P. Hennock's "Fit and Proper Persons; Ideal and reality in nineteenth century urban government", ' in **Victorian Studies**, Vol XIX, No.2, 272-4.

- Thane, P., 1984, 'The Working Class and State
"Welfare" in Britain 1880-1914, in **The Historical Journal**, 877-900.
- Thomis, M.I., 1974, **The Town Labourer and the Industrial Revolution**, Batsford.
- Thompson, D., 1951, **England in the Nineteenth Century**, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Thompson, E.P., 1967, 'Time, Work-Discipline and Industrial Capitalism', in **Past & Present**, No.38, 56-97.
- Thompson, E.P., 1979, **The Making of the English Working Class**, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Thompson, F.M.L., 1981, 'Social Control in Victorian Britain' in **The Economic History Review**, 2nd Series, Vol. XXXIV, No.2, 189-208.
- Thompson, M.W., 1977, **General Pitt-Rivers. Evolution and Archeology in the Nineteenth Century**, Moonraker Press, Bradford-on-Avon.
- Thompson, P., 1986, 'The lost Elementary Schools of Victorian England', in **New Society**, Vol.70, No.146.
- Trevelyan, G.M., 1968, **British History in the Nineteenth Century and After: 1782-1919**, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Tribe, K., 1978, **Land, Labour and Economic Discourse**, Routledge.
- Waagen, G.F., 1854, **Treasures of Art in Great Britain; being an account of the Chief collections of painting, drawings, sculptures, illuminated manuscripts etc**, (trans. by Lady Eastlake), 3 Vols, Murray.
- Ward, J., & Shaw, S., 1843, **The Borough of Stoke-on-Trent in the commencement of the reign of ... Queen Victoria, comprising its history, statistics, civil policy and traffic ... Also, the manorial history of Newcastle-Under-Lyme**, W. Lewis.
- W.E.A., Local History Group, 1951, **The Potteries in the Year of the Great Exhibition**, W.E.A., Stoke-on-Trent.
- Weber, M., 1968, **On Charisma and Institution Building**, (edited and introduced by S.N. Elsenstadt,), Chicago Univ.Press, Chicago.
- Westwater, M., 1983, 'The Victorian Nightmare of Evolution; Charles Darwin and Walter Bagehot' in **Victorian Newsletter**, No.64, 9-13.

Wigley, J., 1980, **The Rise and Fall of the Victorian Sunday**, Manchester Univ.Press, Manchester.

Wilkenson, J., 1980, **Rational Recreation in the Nineteenth Century Potteries. A Study of Educational Self-Improvement**, Keele MA Thesis.

Williams, R., 1976, **Culture and Society, 1780-1950**, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Wittlin, A., 1949, **The Museum; Its History and its Tasks in Education**, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wood, R., 1967, **Victorian Delights**, Evans.

Young, M.D., & Wilmott, P., 1977, **Family and Kinship in East London**, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Young, M.F.D., (Ed.), 1971, **Knowledge and Control**, Collier-MacMillan.

Also:

The Penny Magazine

The Times

The Gentleman's Magazine

The Illustrated London News (ILN)

The Manchester Guardian

The Staffordshire Advertiser

Parliamentary Papers (PP)

Select Committee Reports and Minutes:

Report from the Select Committee respecting the mode of admission of visitors. (To the British Museum), **Journals of the House of Commons**, Vol 34, p.738, 1772-1774.

Report from the Select Committee on Arts and Manufactures 1835, **British Parliamentary Papers**, 1835, (598),p.375.

1841 Report from the Select Committee on National Monuments and Works of Art, **British Sessional Papers**, 1841, Vol VI, p.439. Appx 2 for details on National Gallery purchases 1825-1840.

Report from the Select Committee on Works of Art 1847-48, (720), XVI, p.651.

Report from the Select Committee on the National Gallery Together with the Proceedings of the Committee, 1852-3.

British Sessional Papers, 1860a, XL, p.100, (Concerning National Gallery purchases under Eastlake).

Report from the Select Committee on the British Museum, 1860b, (540), XVI, p.173.

Report from the Select Committee "to inquire whether it is in the power of Parliament ... to recommend placing Institutions supported by general taxation within the reach of the greatest section of the taxpayers, at hours, on week days, when by the ordinary custom of Trade, such persons are free from toil". 1860c (540),XVI, p.173.

British Sessional Papers, 1857, XIII, p.53. (About labels and catalogues in National collections).

British Sessional Papers, 1859, XV, p.531. (Concerning evening admission to the National Gallery collections).

Bills:

Public Walks and Institutions, **British Sessional Papers**, 1837, (83), IV, 61.

For the Protection of Property contained in Public Museums, Galleries, Cabinets, Libraries, and other Public Repositories, from Malicious Injuries, **British Sessional Papers**, 1845, Vol XXV, 645.

To enable Town Councils to establish Public Libraries and Museums, **British Sessional Papers**, 1850, (74), (347), (606), VIII, 351, 355, 361.

Parliamentary Debates:

1845 Museums Bill, **Hansard**, 3rd Series, 78, 27 Feb-2 April, 1845. p.382ff.

1850 Public Libraries and Museums Bills. **Hansard**, 3rd Series, 110, 13 March, 1850, p.838ff. **Hansard**, 3rd Series, 110, 10 April, 1850, p.154ff. **Hansard**, 3rd Series, 113, 19 July-15 Aug, 1850, p.480ff.

Closure of Museums during World War One, **Hansard**, 5th Series, LXXVIII, 25 January, 1916.